



Anno 1778.

PHILLIPS ACADEMY



OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES  
LIBRARY









HARVARD STUDIES  
IN  
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

*EDITED BY A COMMITTEE OF THE CLASSICAL  
INSTRUCTORS OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY*

VOLUME XXXIX



CAMBRIDGE  
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1928



24735

480

H26

v. 39

## PREFATORY NOTE

THESE Studies are published by authority of Harvard University and are contributed chiefly by its instructors and graduates, although contributions from other sources are not excluded. The publication is partly supported by a fund of about \$7,250, generously subscribed by the class of 1856.

CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE,	}	EDITORIAL COMMITTEE
CARL NEWELL JACKSON,		
JOHN BRADFORD TITCHENER,		







## CONTENTS

ON A NEW FRAGMENT OF DORIAN FARCE . . . . .	I
By Joshua Whatmough.	
HERACLES AND HIS SUCCESSORS . . . . .	7
Andrew Runni Anderson.	
THE DANAOS . . . . .	59
Leicester B. Holland.	
DEMOSTHENES, SON OF ALCISTHENES . . . . .	93
Eric Charles Woodcock.	
SUMMARIES OF DISSERTATIONS FOR THE DEGREE OF PH.D., 1927-28 . . . . .	109
INDEX . . . . .	117



## ON A NEW FRAGMENT OF DORIAN FARCE

By JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

THE possibility that in an apparently unintelligible inscription on a recently published South Italian vase, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, might lurk a word or two of some Italic dialect seemed reasonable enough to lead me to examine the original. Desperately confused, or even utterly meaningless inscriptions — mere inarticulate jumbles of letters — are not, of course, unknown in Greek vase inscriptions; on the other hand, South Italy has disclosed a few bilingual inscriptions, Greek and Messapic (see *Proc. Cambridge [Eng.] Philological Society*, cxxx-cxxxii, 1926, p. 3), and the provenance of the Metropolitan vase raised the hope that its seemingly non-Greek legend might likewise be Messapic. But although this hope was not justified, the inscription itself has yielded, on further study, what seems a reasonable interpretation as Greek.

The vase in question was acquired by the New York Museum, where a record of its previous history is preserved, in 1926, and published in the *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum* in 1927 (vol. XXII, no. 2, Feb. 1927, p. 56). By the courtesy of the Director of Classical Art, Miss G. M. A. Richter, to whom I am indebted also for the privilege of consulting the Museum record relating to it, I examined the inscriptions with some care in April, 1928.<sup>1</sup> It is a bell-krater 30.6 cm. in height (12<sup>1</sup>/<sub>16</sub> in.), with painted scenes, apparently unconnected, on front and back. That on the front is accompanied by four inscriptions, three of them manifestly Greek, the fourth not at first sight intelligible in Greek or any other ancient tongue known to me. Quickly convinced, however, that my first notion (that it might be Messapic) was mistaken, I followed the obvious presumption, that, if articulate at all, it would most naturally be Greek; and such in fact it would appear to be.

This scene, on the front of the vase, has been interpreted by Miss Richter (*Bulletin*, *l.c.*) as a court-scene from some Sicilian or South Italian farce (φλύαξ or ἱλαροτραγωδία). As to the source, she is doubt-

<sup>1</sup> In the company of my friend Mr. E. C. Woodcock, of St. John's College, Cambridge, who confirms the readings given below.

less right; so much is indicated, as Miss Richter pointed out, by the mask and the figure of a boy standing on an eminence to the left of the drawing, together with the word (written left to right)

ΤΡΑΓΟΙΔΟΣ

in which *οι* instead of *ωι* is probably not merely graphic. For (1) the alphabet of these inscriptions is the Tarentine-Ionic, that is, the normal Ionic alphabet with the addition of  $\text{C}\rho$  and  $\text{H}\eta$ , and therefore possessed  $\Omega$ , which is in fact employed in two other legends on this vase; and (2) shortening in medial diphthongs of secondary origin with the first element long, though rare and irregular, is not quite unknown. Even in final syllables in which *-ωι* is original, *-οι* from *-ωι* is not the usual treatment save in West Ionic (Thumb, *Hdb. d. gr. Dial.*, p. 348; Bechtel, *Gr. Dial.* III, pp. 96 sq.); we must also set aside the difficult case of Attic-Ionic *ει* from *ηι* (Bechtel, *ib.* pp. 48 sqq., cf. Brugmann-Thumb, *Gr. Gramm.*, ed. 4, p. 63 on the question of the pronunciation of *ει* from medial secondary *ηι* in Attic). Bechtel, however, cites (*ib.*, p. 50) an isolated *Σοιστρούς* (Paros) beside *Σώνομος* (cf. the Eretrian *Σοιναργο* if correct, Collitz-Bechtel, *Sammlung d. gr. Dial.-Inscr.*, 5313. 180. c, and Hesych. *πρόιρης*, Smyth, *Ionic Dial.* pp. 218 sq., Bechtel III, p. 64), and *στοιήν* from Erythrae, *στοιῆσι* in *R* at Hdt. 3.52 (for *στοιά* see also Meisterhans-Schwyzler, *Gram. d. att. Inscr.*, ed. 3, p. 57, 480 and cf. the Doric *στοιά* IG. XII. iii. 170, 22, from Astypalaea), though in the latter the pronunciation was probably dissyllabic (*οῖ*, not *οῖ*), as in *στοῖά* at Aristoph. *Eccl.* 684, 686, and in the *πατροῖς* (beside *πατρώιος*), also cited by Bechtel, from a metrical inscription (Collitz-Bechtel, 5780.3), where clearly *ωι* was shortened *metri gratia*. Cretan, on the other hand, has *στωιάν* in which *ι* has become consonantal (Bechtel II, p. 677). But Brugmann-Thumb (pp. 80, 385) incline to see shortening in Lesbian, e.g. in *τέκοισι* beside *γράφωσι* (contrast Bechtel's view, I, p. 94), and finally, while Latin *tragoedus* certainly represents *τραγωδός* rather than *τραγοιδός*, the latter is actually recorded in an inscription of the fourth century B.C. from Eleusis, *τραγοιδούς* CIA. IV, ii, 574b 21, which also shows, perhaps as a result of neighboring Boeotian influence, *τοῖ δῆμοι* (5) beside *τοῖ Διονύσῳ* (14). *τραγοιδός*, then, on our vase is not without parallel.

But Miss Richter's interpretation of the whole scene as a court-scene is less certain, as will appear in the sequel. On the right is the



figure of an old man, seated on a kind of bench or table, and, beside him, a basket containing some young creature, a puppy or a kid (?), and, on the table, a dead goose. Out of his mouth proceeds the legend, written *right to left*

ΕΓΩΠΑΡΗΞΩ

The meaning of this, ἐγὼ παρήξω, is obvious enough, though it is not at once so obvious what the object to be supplied to παρήξω must be. Miss Richter suggests μάρτυρα or μάρτυρας. But in Attic usage at least παρέχεσθαι not παρέχειν τεκμήριον, μάρτυρα would be required. It seems more likely that the old man, on his part, volunteers to hand over the basket with its contents, and the goose, to the character on the extreme left, since the one in the middle (a slave?) holds his arms above his head (they are *not* actually tied) and exclaims (again reading *right to left*)

ΚΑΤΕΔΗΣΑΝΩΤΩΧΕΙΡΕ

κατέδης' ἄνω τὸ χεῖρε, in excuse or explanation of his disability or unwillingness to obey the command, as I take it to be, of his master or of a guardian who, as remarked already, stands to the left, holding a staff, and who says

ΝΟΡΑΡΕΤΤΕΒΛΟ

In this inscription I have indicated with a punct five letters which are more or less damaged by the chipping of the paint (all the letters were scratched after firing), but are not, I think, really doubtful or uncertain. The only letters about which it is impossible to be positive are the fifth from the left, which might be I, and the third from the right, which might be P, but in both cases the reading given above, which is also the reading of Miss Richter, is more probable. The third letter (from the left) is certainly P, not Φ, and the second O, not Ω. The last letter (at the extreme right) is equally certain. The inscription is complete. But if we read, as would seem most natural, νοραρεττεβλο, we must be content either to accept a meaningless group of letters, or assume that the language is not Greek, though it is difficult to see what else it can be. We are not, however, obliged to read left to right. The two legends (a) κατέδης' ἄνω τὸ χεῖρε, and (b) ἐγὼ παρήξω are both retrograde, that is, written right to left; yet not all the letters face in that direction. In (a) the fourth Ε, seventh Ξ, ninth Ν, fourteenth Ε, and sixteenth Ρ, that is, five out of the six letters in which it makes any

difference at all in the appearance of the letter to reverse its position, all face *right*, even though the complete inscription read the opposite direction. Similarly in (b), the fourth and sixth letters face not left but right. Clearly the writer was not at home when writing retrograde. Accordingly, notwithstanding the position of the letters Ν, Ρ, Ε, and Β, I propose to read this inscription also right to left,<sup>1</sup> that is

ὀλβεττέρ' ἄρον

and to translate: 'Pick up the basket.' To this the slave in the middle answers: 'I cannot, my hands are tied,' and the old man, further right: 'I'll give it to you.' Taking the three figures in succession thus, we have

A. ὀλβεττέρ' ἄρον.

B. κατέδησ' ἄνω τῶ χεῖρε. Γ. ἐγὼ παρήξω. —|∪—|∪

making iambic measure, with hiatus (or, less likely, elision) at the change of speaker.

This fragment of comedy is otherwise unknown, and it would be idle to guess at the play from which a scene is represented, or at the name of its author. The latter can hardly have been the fifth century Sicilian, Deinolochus (of Syracuse or Acragas), son, pupil, or rival of Epicharmus,<sup>2</sup> whose aid we must invoke to explain the form ὀλβεττήρ (older \*ὀλφεκτήρ) 'basket.' To make that identification at least would be to imply greater corruption in the texts of the glossographers to be quoted below than there is warrant for assuming. In Hesychius we have

ὀλβάχιον· κανὺν. Δεινόλοχος

and

εὐπλουτον κανὺν· εὖ ἔχον πλούτου, διὰ τὰς ἐπ' αὐτῷ ὀλάς. πλούτον γὰρ ἔλεγον τὴν ἐκ τῶν κριθῶν καὶ τῶν πυρῶν περιουσίαν· καὶ οὐλοχύτας τὰ κανᾶ, ἃ οἱ Δωριεῖς ὀλβακῆια

<sup>1</sup> I am sensible of the difficulty of making the inscription run *into* instead of out *from* the speaker's mouth; but students of Greek vases, though they have not been able to furnish me with a parallel, do not consider such a trick of writing (a 'stunt') impossible. So far as the position of the inscriptions in the original goes, it *might* be the *slave* who is saying first ὀλβεττέρ' ἄρον and then also κατέδησε κτλ. In that case there is no difficulty, for the figure to the left will say nothing.

<sup>2</sup> See Pauly-Wissowa *s.v.*, and Kaibel, *Com. Gr. Frag.* I (1899), pp. 149 sqq.

where for the last word ὀλβάκνια has been proposed, or, by Ahrens (*de dial. dor.* p. 51 n.), who rightly saw that in this, as in the following glosses, β stands for an older *f*, ὀλβαχοῖα. But the Etym. Mag. gives at p. 621.20

ὄλεχον (v. l. ὄλαχον) καὶ ὄλβαχον· εἰς τὸ δερβιστήρ

and at p. 257.52, repeated in Suidas, s.v.

δερβιστήρ· τὸ δέρμα. παρὰ τὸ δέρος δεριστήρ, καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ β δερβιστήρ. πλεονάζουσι δὲ τὸ β Συρακούσιοι, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀλβάχνιον. ὀλάχνιον γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ ἀπαθές, τὸ τὰς οὐλὰς ἔχον. σημαίνει δὲ τὸ κανοῦν ἐν ᾧ ἀπετίθεντο τὰς οὐλὰς, ἢ τὰς ὀλὰς

from which Kaibel (*o.c.*, p. 151) would deduce ὀλβάχνιον (cf. πετάχνιον) as the correct form. But there are other variants: οὐλοχοῖον Hesych., ληχοῖον· κανοῦν οὐ λοχοῖον *id.*, this manifestly corrupt ((οὐ)ληχοῖον· κανοῦν οὐλόχοῖον Taylor), οὐλόχυτα (-τας) *id.*, and also, *id.*

ὄλεχθον· τὸν μαζονόμον

It is from ὄλεχθον, mistakenly emended to ὀλέχοον by Schmidt, that we must start. This form stands (cf. Att. ὀλαί, Hom. οὐλαί, Arc. ὀλοαί) for \*ὀλ<sub>f</sub>-εχ-το- 'basket, *lit.* grainholder,' in which the stem vowel -ο- (cf. Hom. οὐλό-χυνται) or -α- (οὐλαί), has been dropped before a following vowel as in such compounds as ἱππ-αγωγός, πέντ-οζος (Brugmann-Thumb, p. 194), and -τ- assimilated to the preceding -χ-. But from -χθ- we may have -κτ- as in ἐκτός, ἀν-εκτός, πλεονέκτης (Brugmann-Thumb, p. 112), cf. ἀγκ-τήρ: ἄγχω, and since β really stands for *f* (though the pronunciation at the date of this vase may have made it a labio-dental, not a bilabial spirant), *f* being regularly preserved in Doric, it cannot take over the aspiration lost by the χ. Substitute for -το- the suffix -τήρ,<sup>1</sup> denoting here not the agent (as in Ἐκτωρ) but the utensil (as commonly in Attic, e.g. ἄορτήρ, ζωστήρ, κλιντήρ, λαμπτήρ and many others, see Fraenkel, *Gesch. d. gr. nom. agentis auf-* -τήρ *etc.*, I, p. 1), with the original ablaut preserved in the acc. -τέρα exactly as in γαστήρ (-τέρ-α), and we have the form given in our inscription. The relationship between the vowels of ὀλβάχνιον and ὀλβεκτήρ, would seem to be due to ablaut, ὀλβάχνιον having the reduced grade before

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ther. ἀρτυτήρ, but Arg. ἀρτύναι, Epid. ἀρτῦνοι.

its *-n̄io-* suffix (cf. ὕπνος: *sopor*), and the reduced vowel ɤ becoming *a* (for this see Guentert, *Ablaut-probleme*, pp. 75 sq., and cf. Buck, *Glotta* I, pp. 128 sq.), rather than to be due to contraction, for *a* + *ε* should give *η* (as in οὐληχόιον) in Doric, not *ā* which is limited to Attic-Ionic, though perhaps *ā* might be explained as due to κοινή-influence. ὀλβ-άχνιον also, then, would show elision in the compound; and οὐλ-οχόιον etc. would show the *o*-grade instead of reduction. Finally, the assimilation of *-κτ-* to *-ττ-*, whilst most characteristic of Cretan (Bechtel, II, p. 707), occurs occasionally elsewhere, e.g. in διαλέττεται at Cumae in Italy (Collitz-Bechtel, 5270), and is regular in Locrian in *sandhi* (e.g. ἐ(τ) τᾱς), cf. Arcadian κακρίνῃ, κακειμέναν, Boeotian δακκύλιος with *-(κ)κ-* from *-τκ-*, Bechtel I, 343. But as Buck well remarks (*Gr. Dial.*, p. 68), assimilation often 'existed colloquially . . . and only sporadically made its appearance in the spelling.' *-ττ-* from *-κτ-* is an easy assimilation, and we need have no hesitation in accepting the form ὀλβεττέρ(α) acc. sg. 'basket.' Indeed, in Hesychius we read, from Tarentum itself, Ἀφραττος ἡ Ἐκάτη παρὰ Ταραντίνοις, in which Kaibel (*Com. Frag. Gr.*, p. 206, no. 81) rightly sees ἡ ἄφρακτος 'cuius templum muro saeptum non erat'; and, in Sicily, ἀτταλίζομαι· πλανῶμαι, Σικελοί (Hesych.), as contrasted with the Attic ἀκταίνω, ἀκτάζω (:ἄγω).



## HERACLES AND HIS SUCCESSORS

### A STUDY OF A HEROIC IDEAL AND THE RECURRENCE OF A HEROIC TYPE

BY ANDREW RUNNI ANDERSON

THE religion of the Greeks from the time that it dawns upon us in their earliest literature presents itself in its permanent characteristics as an anthropomorphic polytheism. The divinities are immortal, but not omnipotent; they are rather to be regarded as supermen and superwomen. It was therefore thoroughly logical that the ranks of these should from time to time receive accessions from supermen and superwomen as they arose. Heracles, Dionysus, Castor and Pollux, and occasionally Asclepius are to be regarded as such additions, human beings deified because of conspicuous services to mankind.<sup>1</sup> It

<sup>1</sup> These with the addition from the Roman side of Romulus constitute what A. Elter, *Donarem Pateras* (Bonn, 1907), p. 40, calls "ein bestimmter Kanon von Halbgöttern." The principal passages bearing on the matter are as follows: Cicero, *de Nat. Deor.* 2, 24, 62: Suscepit autem vita hominum consuetudoque communis, ut beneficiis excellentis viros in caelum fama ac voluntate tollerent. Hinc Hercules, hinc Castor et Pollux, hinc Aesculapius, hinc Liber etiam . . . hinc etiam Romulus, quem quidem eundem esse Quirinum putant; quorum cum remanerent animi atque aeternitate fruerentur, rite di sunt habiti, cum et optimi essent et aeterni. Cf. *de Legg.* 2, 8, 19. Horace, *C.* 3, 3, 9 ff.; *Epp.* 2, 1, 5 ff., to be quoted later. *Tusc. Disp.* 1, 12, 27-28; Mortem non interitum esse omnia tollentem atque delentem, sed quandam quasi migrationem commutationemque vitae, quae in claris viris et feminis dux in caelum soleret esse, in ceteris humi retineretur et permaneret tamen. Ex hoc et nostrorum opinione 'Romulus in caelo cum dis agit aevum' ut famae ad-sentiens dixit Ennius, et apud Graecos indeque perlapsus ad nos et usque ad Oceanum Hercules tantus et tam praesens habetur deus; hinc Liber Semela natus eademque famae celebritate Tyndaridae fratres, qui non modo adiutores in proeliis victoriae populi Romani, sed etiam nuntii fuisse perhibentur.

These and other passages from Ennius, Cicero, Silius Italicus, together with Lactantius's discussion of the pagan views of deification from the Christian point of view in the first book of his *Divine Institutes*, esp. 1, 9-1, 18, are presented by Elter, *op. cit.* 40, 3-40, 19. His exceedingly valuable discussion of the deification of Romulus and of Scipio Africanus will be taken up later in this paper.

is a trite saying that the Greeks made no hard and fast demarcation between the human and the divine. As far as these divinities are concerned the theory of Euhemerism is gratuitous.

Zeus is the father of both gods and men; but since the divinity of blood is likely to be diluted through remoteness of descent, it becomes essential that there be a reinfusion of divine blood in the case of those who are to be raised to divine status. One parent, therefore, generally the father, would have to step aside in favor of a god, thus paying the penalty for having begotten an immortal.<sup>1</sup> Thus Amphitryon as the father of Heracles, and Tyndareus as the father of Castor and Pollux and Helen, were thrust aside in favor of Zeus. But polytheism was destined to give way to monotheism. Had it not been for this development, Greek mythology would have undergone still further growth, there would have been further deifications, and we should be studying Alexander and Caesar and Augustus not primarily as historical characters, but as hero-gods added to the Greek or to the Greco-Roman pantheon. In fact this is the view of them that the pagan world took, and it is only the rise of Christianity that prevents us from taking the same view. They are *par excellence* the successors of Heracles.

#### HERACLES

The type of Heracles rather than that of any of the others has been chosen because he is sufficiently early to be an original for what may be regarded our western civilization, and because his contacts and applications are more numerous and generally more intimate for mankind than are those of the others constituting the canon of demigods. The result is that an extraordinarily large number of great men have aspired to him as their ideal of achievement or been compared to him by their admirers. Furthermore, the moral value of his myth is exceedingly high, as shown for instance in the *Choice of Heracles* by Prodicus preserved for us by Xenophon,<sup>2</sup> which represents him as having the choice between the easy way of living in comfort and pleasure for himself or that of devoting himself altruistically to the service of humanity in what would be a life of toil and suffering, but which would bring culture and civilization to humankind. It was for him ἐξημερῶσαι

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Plato, *Apol.* 27D; Arrian, *Anab.* 4, 1, 1-3 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Memorabilia* 4, 6; Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* 482 end.

γαῖαν,<sup>1</sup> and his great work of civilization included the building of roads and the founding of cities.<sup>2</sup> In his performance of these various labors and services the opposition of Hera supplied his life with materials for many a tragedy. Superficially his end on the pyre on Mt. Oeta might be regarded as retribution for certain infidelities, but symbolically it represents the burning away of his mortal parts and his ascent to heaven in glory.<sup>3</sup> For convenience the rôles played by Heracles might be regarded as two-fold — world-ruler (κοσμοκράτωρ) and protector of man-kind (σωτήρ), the latter approaching that of saviour or even messiah.

Zeus's purpose in begetting him may be inferred from the words of Agamemnon in the *Iliad*, 19, 103-5:

σήμερον ἄνδρα φώσδε μογοστόκος εἰλείθνια  
ἐκφανεῖ, ὃς πάντεσσι περικτιόνεσσιν ἀνάξει,  
τῶν ἀνδρῶν γενεῆς, οἱ θ' αἵματος ἐξ ἐμεῦ εἰσί,

a conception of him that grew and expanded until we find Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 1, 84: κακέϊνος (sc. Ζεὺς) ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτῷ βασιλεύειν τοῦ σύμπαντος ἀνθρώπων γένους, ὡς ὄντι ἱκανῶ, a thought which is probably that of Antisthenes the Cynic<sup>4</sup> and therefore belonging to the fourth century B.C. Heracles is accordingly the first of the Greeks to whom world dominion, in the form of world-monarchy was attributed.

The other main rôle of Heracles, that of σωτήρ, is forecast in Hesiod, *Aspis* 27-29:

πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε  
ἄλλην μῆτιν ὕφαινε μετὰ φρεσίν, ὥς ῥα θεοῖσιν  
ἀνδράσι-τ' ἀλφηστῆσιν ἀρῆς ἀλκτῆρα φυτεύσαι.

So that Dio Chrysostom could say of him *Or.* 1, 84: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων σωτῆρα εἶναι.

<sup>1</sup> Euripides, *Herc. Fur.* 20; cf. pacatum . . . orbem, Verg. *Ecl.* 4, 17.

<sup>2</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, *RE.* Supplementband, III s.v. Heracles, 1010, 37 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Theocritus 24, 86-7 quoted below p. 10; Cicero, *pro Sest.* 143, quoted on p. 37; Ovid, *Met.* 9, 262 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Such seems to have been the thought of Antisthenes in his *Heracles*, perhaps also in his *Cyrus* and in his *Archelaus*; see Kaerst, *Gesch. d. Hellenismus*, Leipzig, 1926, II<sup>3</sup>, 306 and n. 1.



Theocritus, 24, 79 ff.<sup>1</sup> puts the following prophetic utterance in the mouth of Tiresias speaking to Alcmena:

τοῖος ἀνὴρ ὅδε μέλλει ἐς οὐρανὸν ἄστρο φέροντα  
 ἀμβάλειν τεὸς υἱός, ἀπὸ στέρνων πλατὺς ἥρως  
 οὗ καὶ θηρία πάντα καὶ ἀνέρες ἥσσονες ἄλλοι.  
 δώδεκα οἱ τελέσαντι πεπρωμένον ἐν Διὸς οἰκῇ  
 μόχθους, θνητὰ δὲ πάντα πυρὰ Τραχίνιος ἐξεῖ.  
 γαμβρὸς δ' ἀθανάτων κεκλήσεται, οἷ τὰδ' ἐπῶρσαν  
 κνώδαλα φωλεύοντα βρέφος διαδηλήσασθαι.  
 ἔσται δὴ τοῦτ' ἡμάρ, ὀπηνίκα νεβρὸν ἐν εἰνῇ  
 καρχαρόδων σίνεσθαι ἰδὼν λύκος οὐκ ἐθελήσει.

The last two lines (sometimes without real reason suspected of being interpolated) seem to foretell that Heracles will inaugurate an era of idyllic peace — a kind of golden age. Thus Heracles became the symbol of service, an outstanding *σωτήρ* in Greek religion, and to the subsequent pagan world he became the type of hero who chose to do the right irrespective of rewards or consequences.

The fourth century before Christ had in much of its philosophic thought a strong tendency toward monarchy. This was particularly true of the Academy and of the Cynics, by whom it was passed on to the Stoa. As Kampers<sup>2</sup> says: "In der Unzufriedenheit mit den politischen Verhältnissen der Gegenwart erinnerte man sich des Riesengestalts des Heracles, den man zum Muster eines Königs und zum Vorbild für den Welteroberer und Weltbeherrscher machte."

Heracles grew with the geographical horizon. Tacitus, *Germ.* 34: *Ipsium quin etiam Oceanum illa temptavimus: et superesse Herculis*

<sup>1</sup> This passage is quoted by Kukula, *Römische Säkularpoesie*, p. 64, n. 2, in connection with Vergil's Fourth Eclogue, and also by Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes*, p. 52, n. 1. Norden quotes also Aristophanes, *Peace* 1075 ff., thus carrying back still further the conception of the *Tierfriede* among the Greeks:

οὐ γάρ πω τοῦτ' ἐστὶ φίλον μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν,  
 φυλόπιδος λῆξαι, πρὶν κεν λύκος οἶν ὑμναιοῖ.

<sup>2</sup> F. Kampers, *Alexander d. Grosse und die Idee des Weltimperiums in Prophetie u. Sage*, Freiburg (1901), p. 20. Kampers holds that Heracles had attained to this position in Cynic philosophic thought before Alexander and independently of him, a view now apparently concurred in by Kaerst, *Gesch. d. Hell.* II<sup>3</sup>, pp. 306 and n. 1; 310, 379.



columnas fame vulgavit sive adiit Hercules, seu quicquid ubique magnificum est, in claritatem eius referre consensimus, etc. Tacitus was not in a position to know that Hercules had set up his columns even on the Columbia River Highway.

The pervasive power of Heracles's example may be shown by a few illustrations. When Socrates set out to find a man wiser than himself and thus to confute the oracle, he used language which no one could fail to understand as a reminiscence of the labors of Heracles, though he mentioned no name, Plato, *Apol.* 22a: δέῃ δὴ ὑμῖν τὴν ἐμὴν πλάνην ἀποδείξαι ὥσπερ πόνοῦς τινὰς ποιούντος ἵνα μοι καὶ ἀνέλεγκτος ἡ μαντεία γένοιτο.

Likewise, when Lysander was plotting to put himself at the head of affairs in Sparta, we are told by Plutarch<sup>1</sup> that he planned to take the power away from the two royal families and to give it to all the Heraclidae in common; or, as some say, not to the Heraclidae alone, but to all Spartans, that the reward might not belong to the posterity of Heracles, but *to those who were like Heracles* if judged by that personal merit which raised him to godhead, and he hoped that when the kingdom was thus to be competed for, no Spartan would be preferred to himself.<sup>2</sup> Aristotle, because of his ode to Arete<sup>3</sup> in which he names his friend and former patron Hermeias of Atarneus as a successor of Heracles, Castor and Pollux, of Achilles and Ajax, was by his enemies charged with impiety as having written a paeon in honor of a mortal. At this time we may brush technicalities aside, recognize that heroization was in the air, and classify the poem as in essence a paeon. Time was pregnant with other candidates for deification to whom paeans would actually be addressed.

Before proceeding further with my study I desire to make a twofold observation:

I. That in form deification was a religious act, adding a divinity to those already recognized by the state. In a polytheistic religion it

<sup>1</sup> Plut., *Lys.* 24.

<sup>2</sup> I may add that Nicostratus the Argive, cured by Menecrates, was made to assume the rôle of Heracles (Athenaeus, 289b), and that Themison, favorite of Antiochus II, received worship in the rôle of Heracles (Athenaeus, 289 f.-290). Cf. Plut., *Flamininus* 16, 4; ὁ δῆμος Τίτῳ καὶ Ἡρακλεῖ τὸ γυμνάσιον.

<sup>3</sup> Bergk, *frg.* 6.

might be genuinely reverent, or it might through the intrusion of political considerations be more or less obsequious. Taken by itself it might be just as innocuous as the canonization of a saint or the conferring of a high honorary degree. Such deification however, did not regularly come until after death <sup>1</sup>—*immortalitatem ipsa morte quaerebat*, Cic., *Tusc.* 2, 20; *emit morte immortalitatem*, Quintilian 9, 3, 71; *post ingentia facta* (which means after death) Hor., *Epod.* 2, 1.6; or as Callisthenes, as quoted by Q. Curtius 8, 5, 16, says: *hominem consequitur aliquando, numquam comitatur divinitas*. Most important of all are the words of Callisthenes quoted by Arrian, *Anab.* 4, 11, 7: οὐκ οὐν οὐδὲ αὐτῷ τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ ζῶντι ἔτι θεῖται τιμαὶ παρ' Ἑλλήνων ἐγένοντο, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τελευτήσαντι πρόσθεν ἢ πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἐπιθεσπισθῆναι ὡς θεὸν τιμᾶν τὸν Ἡρακλέα.

II. The tendency of Greek philosophic thought toward monarchy gave deification a new phase; it is that when a man's abilities so surpass the combined abilities of his fellows, for him the change of magistrates and subjection to the law can not hold; rather is he as a god among men, against whom the law can not stand, inasmuch as he is himself the law.<sup>2</sup>

This conception was destined to have momentous consequences for the successors of Heracles and for their worshippers and subjects. It made the Greek lovers of the olden liberty sick at heart. The successors of Heracles might henceforth not find virtue its own or its only reward; they might not have to wait until after death to receive the guerdon of deification; it would not be *post ingentia facta*, but *propter ingentia facta*, and divinity instead of following a man might be his concomitant.

#### ALEXANDER <sup>3</sup>

Alexander was descended from Zeus — on his mother's side by way of Achilles and Aeacus, and on that of his father through Heracles

<sup>1</sup> Such was indeed the previous practice of the Macedonian royal house, Baege, *de Macedonum sacris*, Halle (1913), p. 208. Philip's assassination at the wedding of his daughter left it easily to be inferred that he considered himself the thirteenth god, and is significant as well as sinister.

<sup>2</sup> Arist., *Pol.* 3, 13 end, and 3, 17 end.

<sup>3</sup> On the matter of Heracles and his successors the two following works are very illuminating: Seneca, *Ludus de Morte Claudii* (Apocolocyntosis) and Julian,

and Perseus — a most remarkable genealogy. Think of such material coming to such a teacher as Aristotle to be inspired by him with true appreciation for the Greek heroic past and the heroes of the Trojan war, especially Achilles, and to learn from him political wisdom, perhaps the very thought referred to above! Such an initial equipment supplemented by his inheritance from Philip of the kingdom of Macedon with its finely organized army and by his own achievement in conquering the East was bound to bring to maturity thoughts that were both new and great.

Stimulated by his love of Homer, Alexander began his Asiatic conquests as the representative of the Hellene against the barbarian. His

*Caesares* (Symposium). In the former of these *Hercules*, a burlesque character, speaks for, and Augustus *in propria persona* speaks against, the proposed admission of Claudius as *divus* to Olympus. In the latter work Romulus gives a banquet in heaven; for we are told that after Heracles Quirinus also ascended thither, 307B. Heracles asks Quirinus why he did not invite Alexander. Quirinus admits that his descendants have been great admirers of Alexander, 316 B-D, and sends for him. Then speeches are delivered in the following order: Caesar, Alexander, Octavian, Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, Constantine, each stating his claim to be awarded the decision of having proved himself the greatest. The decision being awarded to Marcus Aurelius, each is told to choose his guardian and guide (335D ff.), whereat Alexander hastened to Heracles, Octavian to Apollo, Marcus to Zeus and Kronos, while Caesar was lost until Ares and Aphrodite took pity on him and summoned him to themselves. Trajan hastened to Alexander and sat down by him, and Constantine chose Pleasure and Incontinence and — Jesus. While to Julian himself is given the hope by Hermes that when he departs the mortal life, he will obtain the knowledge of his father Mithra, whom with good hopes he adopts as his guardian guide.

(The idea of the succession or of the recurrence of heroes in Greco-Roman religion or mythology may be paralleled from sacred history. In the transfiguration (Matthew XVII, 2; Mark IX, 2-5; Luke IX, 29-32) Christ was seen to be present with Moses and Elijah. The recently discovered Russian version of Josephus says: "At that time also a man came forward, if one may call a man one whom his disciples called the son of God. . . . His name was Jesus, and he was surnamed the Messiah. By the gentiles he was believed to be a soothsayer, *but some of our own people said of him that he was our first law-giver* (Moses), and had risen from the dead and was showing forth many cures and acts. Others, however, said that he was the envoy of God." See the articles in the *Rev. de l'Histoire des Religions*, XCIII (1926) esp. pp. 15, 27, and 47, by Eisler, Goguel, and Couchoud. See also vol. III of the edition of Josephus in the Loeb Classical Library by Thackeray (1928), pp. 648-9.)



hero seems at this time to have been Achilles.<sup>1</sup> This is shown by his ceremonies on the site of Troy and his oft quoted exclamation in which he esteemed Achilles happy for having found Homer as the herald of his prowess. But it was in the temple of Heracles at Troy that Alexander saw the shield of Achilles. As time went on, however, and his conception of himself as representative of the Hellenes was merged in cosmopolitanism with himself as *cosmocrator*, the sphere of Achilles seems to have impressed him as too localized to serve as his own model, with the result that he inclined more and more to the other side of his ancestry, that is, to Heracles. For instance, when he had a son by Barsine, Memnon's widow, he called his name not Achilles, but Heracles.<sup>2</sup>

As Alexander went on with his conquests his sacrifices to the gods always included Heracles, often Dionysus. At the siege of Tyre Heracles appeared to him in his sleep to encourage him, and at the capture of Tyre the worshippers of Heracles received preferential treatment.

Very illuminating is the statement that Julian, *Caesares* 324-325, puts in the mouth of Alexander, who thus addressed Caesar:

εἶτ' ἐμοὶ τολμᾶς ἀμφισβητεῖν, ὃς ἐκ παιδαρίου στρατηγῶν ἔργα ἔπραξα τηλικαῦτα, ὥστε τὴν μνήμην, καίπερ οὐκ ἀξίως ὑπὸ τῶν συγγραφέων ὑμνηθέντων, ὅμως συμπαραμένειν τῷ βίῳ, καθάπερ τῶν τοῦ Καλλινίκου, τοῦμοῦ

<sup>1</sup> Indeed the conception that he was a second Achilles clung to a certain extent to his tradition. This is seen in the story of Batis the valiant defender of Gaza, who like a second Hector was trailed from Alexander's chariot. See Perrin, *TAPA*, XXVI (1895), pp. 56 ff.; see the further literature on Batis cited by Berve, *Das Alexanderreich* II, p. 105 s.v. Batis.

The parallel between Patroclus and Hephaestion is a striking one, Perrin, *op. cit.*, p. 59, who quotes Arrian, *Anab.* 7, 14, 4: κατὰ ζῆλον τὸν Ἀχιλλέως πρὸς ὄντινα ἐκ παιδὸς φιλοτιμία ἦν αὐτῷ.

<sup>2</sup> Tarn, *Heracles, Son of Barsine*, in *JHS*. XLI (1921), pp. 1 ff., has tried to show that this Heracles was a mere fiction. Berve, *op. cit.*, II, p. 168 (no. 353) does not accept Tarn's view. Although the chronological difficulties are great, the name Heracles is not one which would readily have been invented. The name Alexander Helios which Antony gave to his son by Cleopatra can hardly be anything else than a reflection from Alexander's giving the name Heracles to his son by Barsine, though of course it might just as well be the reflection of an established legend as of reality.



βασιλέως, οὗ θεράπων ἐγὼ καὶ ζήλωτῆς ἐγενόμην, Ἀχιλλεὺ μὲν ἀμιλλώμενος  
τῷ προγόνῳ, Ἡρακλέα δὲ θαυμάζων καὶ ἐπόμενος, ἅτε δὴ κατ' ἔχνος θεοῦ  
ἄνθρωπος.

Staius describes a bronze statuette of Heracles Epitrapezius by Lysippus, which had presumably been made for Alexander by him and which was treated by Alexander as his guardian god. The pertinent part for our purpose is *Silvae* 4, 6, 59 ff.:

Pellaeus habebat  
regnator laetis numen venerabile mensis  
et comitem occasus secum portabat et ortus  
praestabatque libens modo quae diademata dextra  
abstulerat dederatque et magnas verterat urbes.  
Semper ab hoc animos in crastina bella petebat,  
huic acies semper victor narrabat opimas, 65  
sive catenatos Bromio detraxerat Indos,  
seu clusam magna Babylona refregerat hasta,  
seu Pelopis terras libertatemque Pelasgam  
obruerat bello, magnoque ex agmine laudum  
fertur Thebanos tantum excusasse triumphos.<sup>1</sup>

In order to become the legitimate successor of the pharaohs Alexander must secure acknowledgment of his sonship to Ammon. Scholars have frequently pointed out that the obvious place to obtain such acknowledgment was Thebes. In Egypt such acknowledgment was equivalent to deification, not however elsewhere. There must accordingly have been an additional motive to take Alexander so far out of his way as to the Ammoneum on the Oasis of Siwah to have his sonship to Zeus-Ammon confirmed there. Eduard Meyer<sup>2</sup> has suggested that confirmation at the Ammoneum was intended to impress upon the Greeks of the homeland the fact that the oracle of Ammon had now passed into sympathetic attitude toward Alexander, even as that of Apollo at Delphi had previously done. To this should be added the other reasons adduced by Arrian,<sup>3</sup> the fact that Alexander undertook the

<sup>1</sup> *Silvae* 4, 6, 59; Martial 9, 43 and 44 informs us that the statuette in his day was in the house of Novius Vindex, and that in the meantime it had been in the possession of Hannibal and Sulla.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Eduard Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, p. 303; Maspero, *Comment Alexandre devint dieu en Égypte*, republished in *Études de Mythologie et d'Archéologie égyptiennes*, VI (1912).

<sup>3</sup> Arrian, *Anab.* 3, 3, 1-2.

journey emulously following in the steps of his ancestors Perseus and Heracles, both of whom had visited it in days of yore. The full significance of this statement, however, has not been brought out until there is cited in support of it the statement of Callisthenes in his speech, quoted by Arrian,<sup>1</sup> that it was the Delphic oracle that issued the decree that men should honor Heracles as a god. The oracle of Ammon in confirming the sonship of Alexander to Ammon was advancing Alexander toward the same goal as the successor of Heracles.

A significant passage is that of Arrian,<sup>2</sup> which describes the facts leading up to the murder of Clitus: ἀλλ' ἐν γε τῷ πότῳ τότε ὑπὲρ τοῖν Διοσκοῦροιν λόγους γίγνεσθαι, ὅπως ἐς Δία ἀνηνέχθη αὐτοῖν ἡ γένεσις ἀφαιρεθεῖσα Τυνδάρεω. καὶ τινας τῶν παρόντων κολακεία τῇ Ἀλεξάνδρου, οἷοι δὴ ἄνδρες διέφθειράν τε αἰεὶ καὶ οὔποτε παύσσονται ἐπιτρίβοντες τὰ τῶν αἰεὶ βασιλέων πράγματα, κατ' οὐδὲν ἀξιοῦν συμβάλλειν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τε καὶ τοῖς Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργοις τὸν Πολυδεύκη καὶ τὸν Κάστορα. οἱ δὲ οὐδὲ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἀπείχοντο ἐν τῷ πότῳ. ἀλλὰ τὸν φθόνον γὰρ ἐμποδῶν ἵστασθαι τοῖς ζῶσι τὸ μὴ οὐ τὰς δικαίας τιμὰς αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν ξυνόντων γίγνεσθαι.<sup>3</sup>

In 4, 10, Arrian broaches the question of prostration, προσκύνησις, and in 4, 11, he gives the debate between Anaxarchus and Callisthenes, including the latter's statement that Alexander's divinity did not depend on the false assertion that Olympias made about his begetting, but on what he himself might report to mankind on the history of the king. Anaxarchus began the discussion by saying that Alexander was more deserving to be deemed a god than either Heracles or Dionysus. Callisthenes countered by saying that not even to Heracles himself were divine honors paid during his lifetime by the Greeks, and that even after his death they were withheld until a decree had been published by the god at Delphi that men should honor him as a god.<sup>4</sup>

According to Quintus Curtius the opponents of Callisthenes were Agis the Argive and Cleo the Sicilian and not Anaxarchus. He reports the speech of Cleo in indirect discourse<sup>5</sup>: Persas quidem non pie solum, sed etiam prudenter reges suos inter deos colere: maiestatem enim imperii salutis esse tutelam. Ne Herculem quidem et Patrem Liberum

<sup>1</sup> Arrian, *Anab.* 4, 11, fully quoted above on p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> *Anab.* 4, 8, 2-3.

<sup>3</sup> A similar thought in Horace, *Epp.* 2, 1, 9 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Arrian, *Anab.* 4, 11, 7.

<sup>5</sup> Curtius, 8, 5, 11 ff.

prius dicatos deos, quam vicissent secum viventium invidiam; tantum de quoque posteros credere quantum praesens aetas spopondisset. Quodsi ceteri dubitent, semetipsum, cum rex inisset convivium, prostraturum humi corpus. Debere idem facere ceteros et imprimis sapientia praeditos: ab illis enim cultus in regem exemplum esse prodendum.

The response of Callisthenes includes the following:<sup>1</sup> Intervallo enim opus est, ut credatur deus, semperque hanc gratiam magnis viris posteri reddunt. Ego autem seram immortalitatem precor regi, ut et vita diuturna sit et aeterna maiestas. Hominem consequitur aliquando, numquam comitatur divinitas. Herculem modo et Patrem Liberum consecratae immortalitatis exempla referebas. Credisne illos unius convivii decreto deos factos? Prius ab oculis mortalium amolita natura est, quam in caelum fama perveheret. Scilicet ego et tu, Cleo, deos facimus, a nobis divinitatis suae auctoritatem accepturus est rex. Potentiam tuam experiri libet; fac aliquem regem, si deum potes facere! Facilius est caelum dare quam imperium? Di propitii sine invidia, quae Cleo dixit, audierint eodemque cursu, quo fluxere adhuc res, ire patiantur.

When the Greeks reached India they thought that they discovered traces of Heracles and Dionysus. Curtius<sup>2</sup> actually says: Igitur Alexandro finis Indiae ingresso gentium finitimarum reguli occurrerunt imperata facturi, illum tertium Iove genitum ad ipsos pervenisse memorantes: Patrem Liberum, atque Herculem fama cognitos esse, ipsum coram adesse cernique. On the identification Strabo<sup>3</sup> has the following interesting comment: καὶ τὰ περὶ Ἡρακλέους δὲ καὶ Διονύσου Μεγασθένης μὲν μετ' ὀλίγων πιστὰ ἡγείται, τῶν δ' ἄλλων οἱ πλείονες, ὧν ἔστι καὶ Ἑρατοσθένης, ἄπιστα καὶ μυθώδη, καθάπερ καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν. The process of thought by which the identification was made has been stated in several places, Dionysus being identified with the Indian god, Çiva, and Heracles with Krishna.<sup>4</sup> In conformity with this identification, when the Greeks reached the rocks of Aornos, they found that

<sup>1</sup> Curtius, 8, 5, 15 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Curtius, 8, 10, 1 ff.; cf. *Epit. Mett.* 34 (101, 34 Wagner and note).

<sup>3</sup> Strabo, 15, 1, 7 (p. 687).

<sup>4</sup> Schwanbeck, *Megasthenis Indica* (Bonn, 1846), p. 44; for the fragments of Megasthenes see Müller, *FHG.* vol. II, 397 ff.; B. Graef, *de Bacchi expeditione*



it had proved impregnable even to Heracles, whereat Alexander was fired with the ambition to take it and thus to surpass his ancestor.<sup>1</sup> Arrian thinks that Heracles was introduced here merely to serve Alexander in his vainglory. This is grossly unfair. The Greeks naturally believed their religion, that is, their mythology and its divinities to be ecumenical and universal (hence their identifications), and as their geographical horizon was extended, so likewise the sphere through which their gods exerted their power was enlarged. We must here recognize what the Germans very felicitously call *Anknüpfung an den Mythos*.<sup>2</sup>

When on the Hyphasis Alexander's soldiers refused to follow him further, he made a speech in which he set forth his plans.<sup>3</sup> These were to conquer India to the end (he did not know of Indo-China and

*Indica*, Berlin (1886), pp. 1 ff.; B. I. Wheeler, *Alexander the Great*,<sup>2</sup> New York (1925), pp. 427-28.

The passages in which Alexander is associated with the Indian expeditions of Heracles and Dionysus are most of them to be found in the fragments of Megasthenes, *FHG*. II, 397 ff. Inasmuch as my chief interest is with Heracles, I note that the name of Dionysus has been interpolated in Pseudo-Callisthenes in the Ms A in 3, 4, 9 (p. 103, 10 Kroll).

On the general subject of Heracles-Alexander the following passages from ancient literature may be cited: Justin, 12, 7, 12-13; Strabo, 3, 5, 5 end (C 171); Julian, *ad Them.* 253C; Epictetus, 2, 26, 32; Pliny, *N.H.* 4, 39; Plut. *de Fort. Al.*, 1, 10, p. 332 B, 2, 2, p. 334D; 2, 11, p. 341F; *Apophth. Al.* 17, p. 181A; Menander Rhetor, 9, 246W (quoted by Norden): 'Ἀλέξανδρος . . . ὁ μὴδὲ Ἡρακλέους λειπόμενος μηδὲ Διονύσου νομισθεὶς εἶναι χείρων, ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης τὸ μέγιστον καὶ πλεῖστον μέρος μὴ χειρὶ Διὸς παῖς ὄντως χειρωσάμενος.

The following passages from Seneca show the Stoic hostility to Alexander and the resentment that the Stoics felt at his comparison to their hero: *de Ben.* 1, 13, 1: (where one of the Corinthian envoys assures Alexander) Nulli civitatem umquam dedimus alii quam tibi et Herculi. *Ibid.* 1, 13, 2: Herculis Liberique vestigia sequens tamquam caelum . . . teneret (sc. Alexander) quia Herculi aequabatur. *Ibid.* 7, 3, 1: Nec Alexandri tantum vitii fuit quam per Liberi Herculisque vestigia felix temeritas egit. *Epp. Mor.* 94, 63: Indignatur ab Herculis Liberique vestigiis victoriam flectere. Cf. Werner Hoffmann, *Literarische Porträt.*, pp. 52-53.

<sup>1</sup> Arrian, *Anab.* 4, 28-30; *Indica* 5, 8-9; Curtius, 8, 11, 2 ff.; *Epit. Mett.* 46 (103, 30 f.).

<sup>2</sup> Berve, *op. cit.* I, pp. 93-94.

<sup>3</sup> Arrian, *Anab.* 5, 26, 2 ff. Chiefly because of the mention of the Ganges in this speech, of which it is claimed that Alexander could have had no knowledge, and also because of certain geographic dislocations Wheeler in his *Alexander the Great*,



China beyond), as though this included all the land in the East, then turning in the reverse direction to send a fleet into Libya (Africa) and complete the conquest of the world by going west to the Pillars of Heracles. Thus he would have surpassed the record of his great ancestor ἡ οὐκ ἴστε ὅτι ὁ πρόγονος ὁ ἡμέτερος οὐκ ἐν Τίρυνθι οὐδὲ Ἀργεῖ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ ἢ Θήβαις μένων ἐς τοσόνδε κλέος ἦλθεν ὡς θεὸς ἐξ ἀνθρώπου γενέσθαι ἢ δοκεῖν; οὐ μὲν δὴ οὐδὲ Διονύσου, ἀβροτέρου τούτου θεοῦ ἢ καθ' Ἡρακλέα, ὀλίγοι πόνοι. ἀλλὰ ἡμεῖς γε καὶ ἐπέκεινα τῆς Νύσης ἀφίγμεθα καὶ ἡ Ἀορνος πέτρα ἢ τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ ἀνάλωτος πρὸς ἡμῶν ἔχεται. In similar vein Curtius<sup>1</sup> says: Ne infregeritis in manibus meis palmam, qua Herculem Liberumque Patrem, si invidia afuerit, aequabo.

#### HERACLES-ALEXANDER IN THE ALEXANDER ROMANCE

There can be no thoroughgoing distinction between the purely historical and the romantic in the career of Alexander. In this study therefore the division must be somewhat arbitrary. For the legend of Alexander began so conspicuously even during his lifetime, that what people thought of him, and the impression he made upon them are elements that for my purpose are quite as vital as what he in sober history actually was. However unhistorical the Alexander Romance may be, it is in large measure made up of elements that can be traced back to a historical source, and in most ways these deviate less from the reality than the stories of Romulus current in the time of Augustus or Plutarch deviated from the real Romulus.

The story that Philip was not really his father owes its origin chiefly to the strained relations existing between Philip and Olympias. The form that the story of his conception took is probably based on some such story as that told by Plutarch,<sup>2</sup> to the effect that Olympias as part of the cult to which she had been initiated became used to the

pp. 451-2 claims that the speech is a rhetorical composition of the early Christian era.

Tarn, *Alexander and the Ganges*, JHS. XLIII (1923), 93 ff., refers it back to Cleitarchus. Its authenticity has been doubted also by Niese, *Hist. Zeitschr.* XLIII, 41 ff. Berve, *op. cit.*, I, p. 325 and n. 1, seems to favor its authenticity.

<sup>1</sup> Curtius, 9, 11, 29.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, *Alex.* 2; also mentioned by Lucian *Dial. Mort.* 13. The process of growth of the legend of Alexander's birth is given by Carraroli, *La leggenda di Alessandro Magno*, Mondovì (1892), pp. 36, 56.

handling of large tame serpents, and that Philip's love for her cooled after he found a serpent in bed with her. Plutarch also tells of an oracle foretelling to Philip that he would lose the sight of the eye with which through the keyhole he saw Olympias in the embrace of a god.

The author of the Alexander Romance, although he did not preclude the comparison of Alexander with other divinities, as e.g., with Dionysus, represented him predominantly as a second Heracles. In doing this he was as a rule not practising invention, but following tradition. And the story of Alexander as he composed it runs parallel to that of Heracles in a number of outstanding features, e.g., his conception, his birth, some of his achievements such as his taming of Bucephalas, his visit to Delphi, his meeting with the Amazons, and even his death, as the following selections will show.

### *Conception.*

Nectanebos, exiled king of Egypt, flees to Pella in Macedonia where he establishes himself as an astrologer and magician. Conceiving a passion for Olympias he succeeds in being summoned by her to give her advice, inasmuch as Philip had threatened to divorce her because of her barrenness. He promises that to the god Ammon she will bear a son who will be her avenger. The Syrian version 1, 6 (Nectanebos speaking) says: "For this god when he comes to thee will be in the form of a serpent and will creep and crawl on the ground sending forth loud hisses. Then he will return, and his horns will be in the form of those of a ram; thus will he be. Then he will return again, *and will appear in the form of the hero Heracles*; and he will return a third time, and appear in the form of Dionysus, decorated and ornamented with ringlets, and he will return yet again, coming back and appearing in my own form." . . . 1, 7 . . . "And when Nectanebos had said these words, he went to his own chamber; and afterwards at this time he slept with her in the form of Ammon and Heracles and Dionysus." <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> BLBy agree with Sy here. The passage in By is 283 ff.; cf. 345 ff. In trying to explain the combination Ammon-Heracles-Dionysus Weinreich, *Der Trug des Nektanebos*, pp. 12-13 with nn. 1-5 inclusive, has placed the emphasis wrongly. "Ich kann darin nichts anderes erblicken als ein Zugeständnis an jene mythische Genealogie, die das makedonische Herrscherhaus von Herakles und Dionysus abstammen liess, eine Fiktion, von der sowohl Alexander wie auch die Ptolemäer starken Gebrauch machten." Neither Alexander nor the early Ptolemies nor yet

When Philip found out that a serpent-god was his wife's lover, he may well be pardoned for being curious to know whether it was Ammon, or Apollo, or Asclepius. (1, 10 L).

In the Syrian version<sup>1</sup> Ammon appears to Alexander in a dream and explains to him his symbolic conception from Ammon-Heracles-Dionysus, thus confirming what Olympias had told him of his father: "Thou art of my race, and thou hast in thee parts of the characteristics of four gods; and if thou dost not believe that it is possible for a mortal and corruptible man to be born of the race of an immortal and incorruptible god, I tell thee that they are able as men to be of the race of the gods, not in respect of the nature of the body, but in respect of wisdom, intelligence and fore-knowledge. Therefore, by the union of the race of the gods with men, they are able both to know and to do everything that is marvellous and difficult in the world. Now thou hast in thee somewhat of the race of the serpent, *and of Heracles*, and of Dionysus, and of Ammon. Through the serpent thou wilt encircle the whole earth like a dragon; *through Heracles thou wilt be strong like Heracles*, and thou wilt show forth in thy person the finding of power and might; through Dionysus thou wilt continually be in pleasure, and merriment, and joy; and through Ammon who is like myself, thou wilt hold rich sceptre, and thou wilt be lord of the world in royalty and wealth. As regards these words then have no doubt." Only in the Syrian version is this wealth of mythological symbolism given.

The Romance tells of the birth of Alexander in much the same way that Plautus tells of the birth of Heracles in the *Amphitruo*, amid thunder, lightning, earthquakes. Plautus however lacks the astrological elements, and these as found in the Romance, 1, 12 (especially in A and Sy) have been used by Boll and Norden as parallels for the phenomena attending the birth of the child in Vergil's *Fourth Eclogue*.<sup>2</sup>

the Alexander Romance featured Dionysus as a *προπάτωρ* of Alexander. The truer explanation is offered by the Syrian version in the supplement next quoted, namely, that Ammon, Heracles, Dionysus are symbolically Alexander's fathers.

<sup>1</sup> Budge, *The History of Alexander the Great*, Cambridge, 1889, I, 30, p. 37. We must indeed acknowledge that this passage was not a part of the recensio vetusta, but the invention of the Syrian redactor is true to character.

<sup>2</sup> Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes*, p. 21, n. 1.

Boll, *Sulla quarta ecloga di Virgilio*, in *Mem. Acad. Bologna*, 1923.



In the course of time Philip went to the oracle at Delphi to inquire who his successor should be, and received the response that whosoever would ride the wild horse Bucephalas would not only be his successor, but be *κοσμοκράτωρ* besides. Philip therefore expected the birth of a new *Heracles*. Alexander qualified by riding the horse and his father acclaimed him *κοσμοκράτωρ*.<sup>1</sup>

At the feast celebrating the marriage of Philip with Cleopatra, Alexander in some of the manuscripts (By) is described as resenting the charge of illegitimacy there bandied; then, resembling a new *Heracles* at the feast of the Centaurs and Lapiths, or a new *Odysseus* slaying the suitors he drove out the whole company.<sup>2</sup>

Then Alexander went to the temple of Apollo and asked the priestess to give him a response about his future; when she, however, professed that she could not give responses, inasmuch as the god was not inspiring her, Alexander grew angry and said: *καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερὸν ἤξιον τὴν Φοιβηλάον αὐτῷ μαντεύσασθαι. τῆς δὲ λεγούσης μὴ χρησιμοδοτεῖν αὐτῷ τὸ μαντεῖον ὀργισθεὶς ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος εἶπεν. Ἐἰ μὴ βούλει μαντεύσασθαι, βαστάξω καὶ γὰρ τὸν τρίποδα ὥσπερ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἐβάσταξε τὸν φοιβηλάον τρίποδα, ὃν Κροῖσος ὁ Λυδῶν βασιλεὺς ἀνέθετο.* Ἦλθεν δὲ αὐτῷ φωνὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀδύτου. Ἡρακλῆς, Ἀλέξανδρε, τοῦτο ἐποίησε θεὸς θεῶ, σὺ δὲ θνητὸς ὢν μὴ ἀντιτάσσου θεοῖς. αἱ γὰρ πράξεις σου μέχρι θεῶν λαληθῶσιν. τῆς οὖν φωνῆς ἀνενεχθείσης εἶπεν ἡ φοιβηλάος μάντις. Αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς σοι ἐμαντεύσατο τῷ ἰσχυροτέρῳ ὀνόματι προσαγορεύσας. ἐβόησε γὰρ ἐξ ἀδύτων. Ἡρακλῆς, Ἀλέξανδρε, τοῦτο σοι προμηνύων, ὅτι ἰσχυρότερον πάντων δεῖ σε γενέσθαι ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι καὶ ἐς τοὺς αἰῶνας μνημονεύεσθαι.<sup>3</sup>

Sober historians like Ptolemy and Aristobulus make no mention whatever of the meeting of Alexander with the Amazons, thus showing that the theme is not in any sense historical.<sup>4</sup> The theme, however, was one that offered irresistible temptation to writers with romantic imaginations like Onesicritus and Clitarchus, and it is from them that the story including the version as given in the *Alexander Romance*,

<sup>1</sup> *Alex. Rom.* I, 15; I, 17; kernel in Plutarch, *Alex.* 6 end.

<sup>2</sup> *Alex. Rom.* I, 21.

<sup>3</sup> *Alex. Rom.* I, 45 Kroll.

<sup>4</sup> Arrian, *Anab.* 7, 13, 3; Plut. *Alex.* 46.



3, 25-6, is ultimately derived. Thus did they align Alexander with Theseus and Heracles.<sup>1</sup>

In his return march from the far East, as he approached Babylon, if not before, Alexander was met by certain disquieting utterances and prophecies, and even after he reached Babylon they persisted. The one most pertinent to my present purpose is that narrated in the Romance 3, 30, which represents a woman as having given birth to a monstrosity the upper part of which was human and died, but the lower parts consisted of a number of animal heads that lived. The Chaldean soothsayers interpreted the death of the human part as referring to the approaching death of Alexander. "And when Alexander heard all these things, he was in grief and trouble and, sighing, he said, 'O Zeus, it would have been right that I should have finished all my plans and then died; but since it has appeared good unto thee thus, command that they receive me as the *third dead*.' This speech he said for this reason: Dionysus was a man, and because of the name and fame and power he made for himself he was reckoned when dead among the number of the gods; *and in like manner Heracles*; therefore Alexander spoke of himself as 'the third dead' because these had not gained such name and fame and power as Alexander."<sup>2</sup>

It is generally held that in the Greco-Roman world it was Alexander who began the practice of impersonating divinities — a practice that was destined to reach its height in the Roman empire. It may, however, be debated whether Alexander himself actually did this; for there is the possibility that it was only under his successors that the practice came into existence, and that from them it was retroactively carried back to him. The locus classicus on this subject is from Ehippus of Olynthus, a somewhat younger contemporary of Alexander, sometimes suspected of fictional tendencies, as quoted by Athenaeus 537E, where it is stated that at banquets Alexander impersonated Ammon, Artemis, Hermes, and Heracles. Curiously enough Dionysus and Apollo-Helios are not mentioned. The rôle of Heracles has been chosen

<sup>1</sup> Arrian, *Anab.* 7, 13, 5. See also Ausfeld, *op. cit.* in his *Historische Kommentar* to III, 25 on pp. 192-3 where the following passages are cited in addition: Arrian, *Anab.* 4, 15, 4 ff.; 7, 13, 2 ff.; Diod. 17, 77, 1 ff.; Curtius 6, 5, 24 ff.; Justin 12, 3, 5 ff.; Strabo, 505.

<sup>2</sup> Syrian version, p. 135, Budge, 3, 19 (i.e., 30).

for study inasmuch as it seems to be the most typical, the most significant, and the most lasting. A study of the cults will show that Heracles and Dionysus are the gods most intimately connected with the daily life of the Macedonians,<sup>1</sup> and that the same historical character may be identified with more than one divinity,<sup>2</sup> the rôles being complementary rather than competitive.

For example Alexander, Mark Antony, and Augustus each combined in his own person the rôles of a new Heracles and a new Dionysus. Too frequently, however, Alexander-Dionysus had been stressed at the expense of Alexander-Heracles. And yet in spite of the importance to which Dionysus attained under the later Lagids, Heracles came to the ascendant in a number of characters like Julius Caesar, Pompey, and Romulus; in the east where Alexander was equated with Gilgamesh or with Artagnes; and in the Roman emperors who succeeded Augustus, not to mention the Alexander Romance and even down into the middle ages in Lambert li Tors. In fact there are at least two places in the Greek Alexander Romance where the rôle of Dionysus can be proved to be an interpolated one: Dionysus before Aornus, 3, 4, 9A; Dionysus at Tyre, 1, 35 A, Ar, B, C, L, (see Ausfeld, *op. cit.*, *Histor. Kommentar* to I, 35). The extreme development is seen in the Syrian version.

Half a century after Alexander's death Theocritus<sup>3</sup> represented Ptolemy and Alexander as deified in heaven and there serving as the paladins of Heracles, to whom they both trace back their lineage, both now ageless, the one escorting him as he carries his bow for him and the other his club. The absence of Dionysus from this scene is significant. It is only under the subsequent Lagids,<sup>4</sup> when Dionysus

<sup>1</sup> Baegel, *de Macedonum sacris*, pp. 77 ff.; 184 ff.

<sup>2</sup> An extreme instance of this may be cited in the case of Caligula who, according to Dio Cassius, 59, 26, 5 ff., and Philo, *de Leg.* 11 ff., appeared impersonating the rôles not only of a large number of gods, but also of goddesses! Cf. Alexander's impersonation of Artemis, charged to him by Ephippus as stated above. The passages for Caligula are cited by Riewald, *de imperatorum Romanorum cum certis dis et comparatione et aequatione*, Halle (1912), pp. 281-3.

<sup>3</sup> Theocritus, 17, 13-33, a passage too long for quotation.

<sup>4</sup> Kornemann, *Zur Geschichte der antiken Herrscherkulte*, in *Klio*, I (1902), pp. 51 ff., has brought this out on p. 67, n. 5, namely that the descent of the Lagids from Heracles was emphasized only by the earlier Ptolemies, and was then later pressed into the background by the later ones. The effect of this was made retro-

had become identified with Osiris, that Dionysus comes into prominence both as *κοσμοκράτωρ* and as *εὐεργέτης* and the divinity with whom the male ruler of Egypt was identified.

active, and on p. 70 he says: "Bemerkenswert ist noch, dass jetzt Dionysus als der Stammvater der aegyptischen Dynastie und als derjenige 'dem Alexander sich wesensverwandt gefühlt hatte' (Prott, p. 462) über dem ganzen thront."

Overemphasis on the extent to which Alexander appeared as Dionysus in cult and legend is found in Kern's article on Dionysus in Pauly-Wissowa, V, 1039 ff. and above all in the article of Miss Lily Ross Taylor on *προσκύνησις* in *JHS*. XLVII (1927), pp. 53 ff. She says on p. 61: "Significantly enough it was as Dionysus, the god with whom the good *δαίμων* honored at banquets was identified, the deity of unmixed wine, that the Athenians vouched for his godhead (Diog. Laert. 6, 2, 63), and it is as Dionysus too that the king lived in story in the East." The success of this symbolical *προσκύνησις* (p. 62) "prepared the way for the identification of Alexander with Dionysus in cult and legend, and it persisted in the honor offered at banquets to the guardian spirits of Hellenistic kings and Roman emperors."

Miss Taylor's argument that the use of wine in the symbolic *προσκύνησις* of Alexander identified him with Dionysus is far from cogent. She gives the impression of forbidding other identification, particularly with Heracles. That Dionysus deserves no such exclusiveness ought to be perfectly clear from the evidence submitted in this paper. The close relation existing between Alexander and Heracles is established by such passages as Theocritus, 17, 13 ff., and Statius *Silvae* 4, 6, 59 ff. Augustus's identification with Mercury or with Romulus-Quirinus or with Apollo-Helios did not preclude his being compared with Dionysus or with Heracles. (See p. 24 with n. 2.) Most striking of all, however, is the passage in Horace referring to the worship of Augustus and addressed to Augustus, *C.* 4, 5, 31 ff.: (Note that Horace cites Castor and Hercules as parallel in Greek usage to the *numen* of Augustus)

Hinc ad vina redit laetus et alteris  
Te mensis adhibet deum;  
Te multa prece, te prosequitur mero  
Defuso pateris et Laribus tuum  
Miscet numen, uti *Graecia* Castoris  
*Et magni memor Herculis.*

See also Riewald *op. cit.*, p. 318, who cites no evidence of a Lagid identified with Dionysus before Ptolemy IV, Philopator, 222-205/4 B.C.

With reference to Dionysus-Alexander there may be quoted besides Diog. Laert. 6, 2, 63, the painting by Protogenes of Dionysus-Alexander and Pan; see Berve, *Alexanderreich*, II, no. 666. Meineke's proposal, however, that the *Dionysalexandros* of Cratinus was by a younger Cratinus and that it alluded 'ad Alexandri Magni expeditionem, Dionysiaca pompae adsimulatam' has been proved to be wrong by Kock, *Fragmenta Att. Com.* I, p. 23. Alexander's Bacchanalian procession through Carmania is romance and not history.



*Alexander and World Empire.*

This study considers Alexander in the rôle of *κοσμοκράτωρ* from the Greek view as a successor of Heracles. The rôle of *κοσμοκράτωρ* in succession to Dionysus was hardly in accordance with the Greek tradition, but it was made possible by Egyptian influence and by syncretism. Tarn<sup>1</sup> has expressed doubt as to whether we have any authentic record of Alexander's plan of world kingdom, and he holds that the two passages in Diodorus, 17, 93, 4 (which goes back to 17, 51, 2) and 18, 4, 4, are derived from Egyptian ritual and theologumena. His latter contention is valid, and there should be quoted in connection with it an earlier passage from Diodorus, 3, 73, 1, which speaks of Dionysus as having conquered the world.<sup>2</sup> It should be pointed out that among the Egyptians Sesostris was the traditional world conqueror. Furthermore, Alexander's name was early brought into connection with other alleged world conquerors, e.g., Tearcon, Nebuchadnezzar, Idanthyrus, Semiramis, and Cyrus.<sup>3</sup> It is worth mentioning also that the Alexander Romance does not make Alexander in his capacity of world conqueror a successor of either Heracles or Dionysus, but of Sesonchosis.<sup>4</sup>

Alexander's coming was early associated with the appearance of a star. This is implied by the words of Cicero:<sup>5</sup> *Qua nocte templum Ephesiae Dianae deflagravit, eadem constat ex Olympiade natum esse Alexandrum, atque ubi lucere coepisset, clamitasse magos pestem atque perniciem Asiae proxima nocte natam.*<sup>6</sup>

A star appears in the so-called Ptolemy Cameo of the Hermitage in St. Petersburg.<sup>7</sup> Associated with the star is a winged serpent, that

<sup>1</sup> *Alexander's ὑπομνήματα and World Kingdom*, in *JHS*. XLI (1921), p. 1 f.

<sup>2</sup> Kaerst, *Gesch. d. Hell.* II<sup>3</sup>, p. 186, n. 2; E. Bethe, *Quaestiones Diodoreae mythographae*, Gött., 1887.

<sup>3</sup> Strabo, 15, p. 687.

<sup>4</sup> *Alex. Rom.* I, 34, 2 ΚΓ: ὑπαντῶντες δὲ τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν οἱ προφῆται τοὺς ἰδίους θεοὺς κομίζοντες ἀνηγόρευον αὐτὸν νέον Σεσόγῳσιν κοσμοκράτορα. *Ibid.* 3, 34, 4ΚΓ: ἐπεὶ δὲ εἰς Πηλοῦσιον ἦλθον, οἱ Μεμφῖται ὑπήντησαν σὺν αὐληταῖς καὶ ἀγάλμασιν κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς καὶ εἰσήγαγον εἰς Μέμφιν ὡς Σεσόγῳσιν κοσμοκράτορα ἡμίθεον.

<sup>5</sup> Cicero, *de Div.* I, 47; cf. Plut. *Alex.* 3, 3.

<sup>6</sup> So interpreted by Kampers, *op. cit.* pp. 24, 115.

<sup>7</sup> Furtwängler, *Antike Gemmen*, vol. I, Plate LIII, 2 with notes in vol. II, p. 251.



appears both in this St. Petersburg cameo and in the Vienna Cameo,<sup>1</sup> and there is also the bearded face of a youth, which Furtwängler identifies with that of Alexander, and which he finds recurring on the Blakas cameo of Augustus.<sup>2</sup>

I give next the death scene of Alexander from the Romance as constituted by Ausfeld<sup>3</sup> in my own translation: "Then Ptolemy went up to him and said: 'Alexander, to whom dost thou leave thy kingdom?' and he answered: 'To him that hath power and will to save and to fulfill.' And when Alexander had said this, straightway a dense mist formed and darkness came on, and the fiery shape of a serpent descended from heaven to the sea, and therewith a great eagle, and the image of Zeus in Babylon was shaken. And the serpent ascended again to heaven and the eagle followed it carrying a bright star. And when the star was lost in the heavens, Alexander closed his eyes."

The tradition persisted, however, that Alexander was not really dead but merely slumbering or translated, and that he would return as the king in glory. One such reappearance is told by Dio Cassius, 79, 18. Centuries afterward, when Christianity was grappling with Islam in the near East, probably under the emperor Leo VI (886-911), there arose the hope and the prophecy that he would return at the sign of a bright star, "ein Heroldruf wird erschallen, zwei Engel in Eunuchengestalt finden den König und führen ihn herbei. Unter Wundern vollzieht sich seine Krönung. Der leuchtende Stern fällt hernieder. Mit himmlischem Licht wird der König gesalbt. Er wird den Islam besiegen und dann nach Zion hinaufziehen."<sup>4</sup>

The same star that marked his passing was destined to reappear as the comet that typified the soul of Caesar, the heir of Alexander's political ideals, and the form and ceremonial of deification of the Roman emperor was a combination of the pyre of Heracles and Hephaes-

<sup>1</sup> Furtwängler, *op. cit.* Plate LIII, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Furtwängler, *op. cit.* vol. III, p. 316 with fig. 159.

<sup>3</sup> *Der Griechische Alexanderroman*, III, xxxiii, III, p. 120.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted from Bousset, *Beitraege*, p. 284; cf. Kampers, *op. cit.* pp. 114-115. The star of Alexander, and the comet of Caesar clearly antedate the star of Bethlehem. The star which presumably heralded Alexander's birth reappears in the legend of Alexander Severus; Lampridius in *Scrip. Hist. Aug.* XVIII, 13, 5: fertur die prima natalis toto die apud Arcam Caesaream stella primae magnitudinis visa et sol circa domum patris eius fulgido ambitu coronatus.

tion, the eagle of Zeus and Alexander, with hopes that the ascending soul would take the form of a star.

The identification of Alexander with Heracles had certain far-reaching results. It was not merely a case of the syncretism of the two; but it involved in some particulars the supplanting of Heracles by Alexander. Thus Alexander's horns are at times found transferred to Heracles,<sup>1</sup> and as a result of Alexander's conquests Heracles was in the course of time provided with pillars in the far east bearing his name.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, there came to be associated with Alexander certain features of astrological symbolism, for which Heracles furnishes no parallel, and in tracing the Heracleian succession in the large it becomes necessary to include these.

We may believe that even during the lifetime of Alexander his coins with the head of Heracles seem to assume the Macedonian's features,<sup>3</sup> and on the silver coins of his successors the head of Heracles was replaced by that of Alexander.<sup>4</sup> Pictures and medallions show him with the spoils of a lion artistically fashioned to cover his head,<sup>5</sup> and Athenaeus<sup>6</sup> quotes Ephippus as saying that Alexander frequently appeared wearing a lion's skin and carrying the club of Heracles. Lampridius<sup>7</sup> in the *Augustan History* speaks of Alexander Severus as holding an "agon Herculeus in honorem Alexandri Magni," and Trebellius Pollio,<sup>8</sup> *Augustan History*, describes a banquet given by Cornelius Macer in the temple of Heracles in honor of Alexander the Great. In the twelfth century of our era Lambert li Tors<sup>9</sup> represented the

<sup>1</sup> Gruppe in Pauly-Wissowa, Supplementbd. III, 986.

<sup>2</sup> *Alex. Rom.* 2, 34C; 3, 27AArVa; *Itin. Alex.* 54 Volkmann.

<sup>3</sup> L. Mueller, *Numismatique*, Copenhagen (1855), p. 15.

<sup>4</sup> Kaerst, *Gesch. d. Hell.*, Leipzig (1926), II<sup>3</sup>, p. 381, n. 2

<sup>5</sup> Best seen in some of the Tarsus Medallions.

<sup>6</sup> Athenaeus 537 f.

<sup>7</sup> Alexander Severus, XVIII, 35, 4.

<sup>8</sup> *Trig. Tyr.*, Quietus, 14, 3 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. e.g., Lambert li Tors, *Li Romans d'Alexandre*, pp. 55-56 ed. Michelant:

En le tierce partie de l' tref, estoit comment  
Hercules fut concius et nés premièrement;  
com il jut en son lit, petit et de jouvent,  
et Juno sa marastre qui le haoit forment.  
ii. serpens i tramist por envenimement  
quant Hercules les vit, s'es prit premièrement

third side of Alexander's tent as covered with scenes of the birth and achievements of Heracles, his great prototype and ancestor.

It is a well established fact that the Roman religion of the regal period was animistic and that its *numina* were mere spirits that neither had human form nor were worshipped in temples. Plainly in a religion of this sort that lacked every trace of anthropomorphism, it was neither practicable nor desirable to be deified; there could be no successors of Heracles on Roman soil until there had been a decided advance into anthropomorphism. This development, which is a perfectly normal one in religion, would naturally have come about of itself in the course of time; but, as it was, it was accelerated by the spread of Greek religious concepts and of Greek mythology to Italy, especially the extension of the Trojan cycle to explain and to include Roman origins. In establishing this in the Roman consciousness the influence of Ennius was profound, and his euhemerism has a particularly close bearing on the deification of Romulus and Scipio. In the course of time also there came in from the East such influences as Babylonian astrology and oriental prophecies of world empire, and these influences, when Rome's world dominion was an accomplished fact or all but an accomplished fact, would explain this empire as something fated from the very beginning.

#### ROMULUS

The first successor to Heracles on Roman soil was Romulus, and here the words of Cicero<sup>1</sup> may be taken as the point of departure:

Romulus in caelo cum dis agit aevum,  
ut famae adsentiens dixit Ennius, et apud Graecos indeque perlapsus ad  
nos et usque ad Oceanum Hercules tantus et tam praesens habetur deus, etc.

---

à ses puins k'il ot gros, les ocist erraument,  
puis conquist-il le tiere desi en Orient;  
\*iluec mit-il ses bones, voiant tote la gent;  
tout ensi le voit-on e l' tref apertement.  
en le fin de l'estore i est com faitement  
le ciel tient sor sen col, par son encantement.  
Alixandres li rois i esgarde souvent,  
et quant l'a remiré, si fait sen serement  
que tout ensi fera, si il vit lonjement.

<sup>1</sup> *Tusc. Disp.* I, 12, 28; the passage is quoted in full above, p. 7, n. 1.



In the interpretation of this passage the following facts are to be noticed:

1. That the influences that brought about the deification of Romulus came from the Greeks, and that consequently neither Romulus nor his contemporaries had anything to do with it.

2. That his fame and deification followed in the steps of Heracles, his *dux in caelum*, if we may use this expression with a somewhat changed meaning.<sup>1</sup>

3. That Ennius did not originate his deification, but *famae adsentiens*, consummated it and established it in literature. That the fame of Romulus followed after that of Heracles, and that the stage for his deification was already set before the time when Ennius wrote his *Annals* may be seen from a Roman-Campanian coin of about the year 300 B.C., pictured in Roscher.<sup>2</sup> The obverse of this coin has the head of Hercules, while on the reverse is shown the she-wolf suckling Romulus and Remus. Pertinent also is the statement of Julian<sup>3</sup> where Romulus gives a banquet in heaven; "for we are told that after Heracles Quirinus also ascended thither."

Livy, I, 7, 10, is most important in this connection: *Ubi nomen patremque ac patriam accepit (sc. Evander) "Iove nate, Hercules, salve," inquit, "te mihi mater, veridica interpres deorum, aucturum caelestium numerum cecinit tibi que aram hic dicatum iri, quam opulentissima olim in terris gens maximam vocet tuoque ritu colat."* The

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Elter, *op. cit.*, p. 40, 33: Also das Beispiel des in Rom verehrten, nun aber wieder hellenisierten Hercules hat den Römern dazu verholfen, den Gründer ihrer Stadt als Sohn eines Gottes zum Gotte zu erheben; und nicht einmal durch blosser Uebertragung der griechischen Auffassung des Hercules ist Romulus Gott geworden, sondern mit ausdrücklicher Anlehnung an die Person des Hercules. . . .

Wie die fast stehende Verbindung des vergötterten Romulus mit Hercules beweist, hat man auch Romulus von Anfang an als Gott sich nicht anders vorzustellen vermocht als mit Hercules zusammen, d.h. so, dass ihm wieder Hercules *dux in caelum* war, und wenn er dann weiter so ausser mit Hercules auch mit den Castores und Liber verbunden wird, so heisst dass wiederum nichts anderes, als dass er in ihre Gesellschaft aufgenommen wird, ein Gott wird oder vielmehr ein Halbgott wie sie es waren, nicht sowohl nach altrömischer als vielmehr nach griechischer Auffassung.

<sup>2</sup> Roscher's *Lexikon*, IV, 202, where other references also are given.

<sup>3</sup> *Caesares* 307B.

worship of Hercules *graeco ritu* established by Evander was continued by Romulus, and the forecasting of Hercules's deification is made the basis of Romulus's own immortality in section 15: *Haec tum sacra Romulus una ex omnibus peregrina suscepit, iam tum immortalitatis virtute partae, ad quam eum sua fata ducebant, fautor.*

The identification of Romulus as a successor of Hercules was further helped by the fact that each was the mightier twin; and even as Heracles had received Hebe, Romulus in becoming Quirinus carried Hersilia with him to a higher plane as Hora:

Quirine pater veneror Horamque Quirini.<sup>1</sup>

Her deification is related by Ovid:<sup>2</sup>

Hanc manibus notis Romanae conditor urbis  
Excipit, et priscum pariter cum corpore nomen  
Mutat, Horamque vocat, quae nunc dea iuncta Quirino est. 850

Thus *post ingentia facta*, beginning with the founding of the city, the city destined to become caput orbis terrarum,<sup>3</sup> Romulus was deified and supplied with the requisite divine ancestry going back to Aphrodite; but inasmuch as he was fourteen generations removed from Troy, the reinfusion of divine blood was supplied by Mars, god of war, as his father. It did not disturb the myth-makers that at the time of Romulus Mars was still a vegetation spirit. Thus his legend, starting with the fact that he was the founder of Rome, was expanded by agencies similar to those we have seen at work on Alexander, and astrologers constituted it in the form in which we find it in Plutarch, *Rom.* 12, 2 ff.

#### SCIPIO AFRICANUS

From the present writer's point of view the most valuable part of Elter's program, *Donarem pateras*, is that in which he considers the deification of Scipio. Wissowa has indeed accepted his general conclusion so far as the deification is concerned, but the historians of literature have not been properly impressed with his conclusion as

<sup>1</sup> Ennius, *Ann.* 117.

<sup>2</sup> Ovid, *Met.* 14, 829 ff.; 849-51 are quoted above. Elter, however, did not establish his position that it was Ennius who carried through the identification of Romulus with Quirinus; see Wissowa, *Religion u. Kultus der Römer* (1912), p. 155, n. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Livy, 1, 16, 7.

affecting Ennius's *Scipio*.<sup>1</sup> Taking a suggestion from Horace<sup>2</sup> in combination with evidence supplied by such writers as Cicero, Lac-tantius, and Silius Italicus he comes to the following conclusions:

1. That Ennius, even as he had consummated the deification of Romulus, made an attempt to deify Scipio Africanus.
2. That the attempt to deify Scipio was made after he had been successful in deifying Romulus.
3. That the work in which the deification of Scipio was attempted was the *Scipio* and not the *Annals*.
4. The probability that the canon of demigods was established for later Roman writers by Ennius — Hercules, Dionysus, the Dioscuri, Romulus — without Asclepius and Alexander — and that Horace and Vergil, when they bring Augustus into this company, were following in the steps of Ennius.

The attempt to deify Scipio was abortive, but such traces of it as are still extant show that those who constituted the legend considered him now as a new Hercules, now as a new Alexander.

For example, his brilliant conduct in the Spanish campaigns including the capture of Carthago Nova and the spoils that these brought may have suggested comparison with Hercules. When this was supplemented by his victories over Hannibal and Antiochus, he very naturally became for this period the Roman representative to set over against Alexander. His scrupulous care to find out the will of the gods and his observance of all the formalities in ascertaining it, his frequent visits to the temple of Capitoline Jupiter at the end of night before daybreak — all this had the effect of making people think that he was in close communion with Jupiter.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, it might also suggest by way of comparison Alexander's high regard for the oracular utterances of Ammon and Alexander's alleged sonship to Ammon — a story that might easily react on the Roman popular belief so as to make Scipio actually the son of Jupiter. His mother's death in giving him

<sup>1</sup> Teuffel, vol. I<sup>6</sup> (1916) does not mention Elter's view at all. Schanz, I, 1<sup>3</sup> (1907), came too early to consider Elter's conclusions.

<sup>2</sup> Horace, C. IV, 8, 15 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Livy, 26, 19; Dio Cassius, 16, 39. Polybius, 10, 2, 9, and Valerius Maximus, 1, 2, 1 hold that Scipio in his close adherence to such religious forms was utterly insincere.



birth also was given due interpretation in the construction of the legend. When after the peace with Antiochus both he and his brother were charged with malfeasance in office — a charge that may well have been due to private enmity and party politics — his name went under a cloud, and he retired from the people's gaze to Liternum. The public mind was ultimately left in uncertainty both as to the time and the place of his death — perhaps doubting whether he actually did die — and in confusion as to where he was really buried, if indeed he actually was buried anywhere.<sup>1</sup> Such are the speculations that grew up about his death, and as in the case of Alexander they provided the stuff out of which legends of deification are made.

The chief passages dealing with his conception, birth, and his religious practices are as follows:

Gellius 6, 1, 1: Quod de Olympiade, Philippi regis uxore, Alexandri matre, in historia Graeca scriptum est, id de P. quoque Scipionis matre, qui prior Africanus appellatus est, memoriae datum est. nam et C. Oppius et Iulius Hyginus aliique, qui de vita et rebus Africani scripserunt, matrem eius diu sterilem existimatam tradunt, P. quoque Scipionem, cum quo nupta erat, liberos desperavisse. postea in cubiculo atque in lecto mulieris, cum absente marito cubans sola condormisset, visum repente esse iuxta eam cubare ingentem anguem eumque his qui viderant territis et clamantibus elapsum inveniri non quisse. id ipsum P. Scipionem ad haruspices rettulisse, eos sacrificio facto respondisse fore ut liberi gignerentur, neque multis diebus, postquam ille anguis in lecto visus est, mulierem coepisse concepti fetus signa atque sensum pati. exinde mense decimo peperisse natumque esse hunc P. Africanum, qui Hannibalem et Carthaginienses in Africa bello Poenico secundo vicit. sed et eum inpendio magis ex rebus gestis, quam ex illo ostento virum esse virtutis divinae creditum est.

---

<sup>1</sup> Livy, 38, 53, 8: Silentium deinde de Africano fuit. vitam Literni egit sine desiderio urbis: morientem rure eo ipso loco sepeliri se iussisse ferunt monumentumque ibi aedificari, ne funus sibi in ingrata patria fieret.

*Ibid.*, 38, 56, 1 ff.: Multa alia in Scipionis exitu maxime vitae dieque dicta, morte funere sepulcro, in diversum trahunt, ut, cui famae, quibus scriptis adsentiar, non habeam. non de accusatore convenit: alii M. Naevium, alii Petilios diem dixisse scribunt, non de tempore, quo dicta dies sit, non de anno quo mortuus sit, non ubi mortuus aut elatus sit: alii Romae, alii Literni et mortuum et sepultum. utrobique monumenta ostenduntur et statuae: nam et Literni monumentum monumentoque statua superimposita fuit. quam tempestate disiectam nuper vidimus ipsi, et Romae extra portam Capenam in Scipionum monumento tres statuae sunt, quarum duae P. et L. Scipionum dicuntur esse, tertia poetae Q. Ennii, etc.

Id etiam haud dicere piget, quod idem illi, quos supra nominavi, litteris mandaverint, Scipionem hunc Africanum solitavisse noctis extremo, priusquam dilucularet, in Capitolium ventitare ac iubere aperiri cellam Iovis atque ibi solum diu demorari quasi consultantem de re p. cum Iove, aeditumosque eius templi saepe esse demiratos, quod solum id temporis in Capitolium ingredientem canes semper in alios saevientes neque latrarent neque incurrerent.

Livy 26, 19, 3 ff. Fuit enim Scipio non veris tantum virtutibus mirabilis, sed arte quoque quadam ab iuventa in ostentationem earum compositus, pleraque apud multitudinem aut per nocturnas visas aut species velut divinitus mente monita agens, sive et ipse capti quadam superstitione animi, sive ut imperia consiliaque velut sorte oraculi missa sine cunctatione exsequerentur. ad hoc iam inde ab initio praeparans animos, ex quo togam virilem sumpsit, nullo die prius ullam publicam privatamve rem egit, quam in Capitolium iret, ingressusque aedem consideret et plerumque solus in secreto ibi tempus tereret. hic mos, quem per omnem vitam servabat, seu consulto seu temere vulgatae opinioni fidem apud quosdam fecit, ut stirpis eum divinae virum esse crederent, rettulitque famam in Alexandro magno prius vulgatam, et vanitate et fabula parem, anguis immanis concubitu conceptum, et in cubiculo matris eius visam persaepe prodigii eius speciem interventuque hominum evolutam repente atque ex oculis elapsam. his miraculis numquam ab ipso elusa fides est, quin potius aucta arte quadam nec abnuendi tale quicquam nec palam adfirmandi. multa alia eiusdem generis, alia vera, alia adsimulata, admirationis humanae in eo iuvene excesserant modum; quibus freta tunc civitas aetati haudquaquam maturae tantam rerum molem tantumque imperium permisit.

Appian (*Hisp.* 23) adds the very interesting fact that even in his day in public processions they brought the image of Scipio alone out of the Capitol, all the others being taken from the Forum: *καὶ νῦν ἔτι τὴν εἰκόνα τὴν Σκιπίωνος ἐν ταῖς πομπαῖς μόνου προφέρουσιν ἐκ τοῦ Καπιτωλίου, τῶν δ' ἄλλων ἐξ ἀγορᾶς προφέρονται.*

The treatment of Scipio in Lactantius, which goes back principally to Ennius and Cicero, is that of a successor of Hercules. Most striking is his statement in *Div. Inst.* 1,9: Hercules qui ob virtutem clarissimus et quasi Africanus inter deos habetur. In 1, 18 the following statement is made: ille autem qui infinita milia hominum trucidarit . . . non modo in templum sed etiam in caelum admittitur. apud Ennium sic loquitur Africanus:

si fas endo plagas caelestum ascendere cuiquam est,  
mi soli caeli maxima porta patet,

scilicet quia magnam partem generis humani extinxit ac perdidit. o in quantis tenebris, Africane, versatus es, vel potius o poeta qui per caedes et sanguinem patere hominibus ascensum in caelum putaveris! cui vanitati etiam Cicero adsensit.<sup>1</sup> est vero, inquit, Africane, nam et Herculi eadem ista porta patuit, tamquam ipse plane cum id fieret ianitor fuerit in caelo.

In his treatment of the legend of Scipio, Silius Italicus considers him mainly as a successor of Hercules. There are, it is true, some elements in it which the student of the legend must derive from the legend of Alexander, notably those relating to his conception.<sup>2</sup> Silius, however, does not compare Pomponia to Olympias but brings her into fellowship with Alcmena and Leda, 13, 632-3. It is Mars who informs Scipio that Jupiter was his father, 4, 475-6:

Macte, o macte indole sacra,  
Vera Iovis proles.

In 7, 487 (cf. 13, 625) his origin and future greatness are thus set forth:

Hinc ille, e furto genitus, patruique piabit  
Idem ultor patrisque necem.

Jupiter's passion was aroused by Venus, that thereby a champion of Rome might be born, who would defeat Juno's plan for a triumphant Carthage, 13, 615-620.

Pomponia's conception is strikingly told, 13, 628 ff.:

Excipit his mater: "Nullos, o nate, labores  
Mors habuit nostra: aethereo dum pondere partum  
Exsolvor, miti dextra Cyllenia proles  
Imperio Iovis Elysias deduxit in oras;  
Adtribuitque pares sedes, ubi magna moratur  
Alcidae genitrix, ubi sacro munere Leda.

630

Verum age, nate, tuos ortus, ne bella pavescas  
Ulla, nec in caelum dubites te tollere factis,  
Quando aperire datur nobis, nunc denique disce,  
Sola die caperem medio cum forte petitos  
Ad requiem somnos, subitus mihi membra ligavit  
Amplexus, non ille, meo veniente marito,

<sup>1</sup> *De Rep.* frg. inc. 6; cf. Seneca *Ep.* 108, 34.

<sup>2</sup> See Aulus Gellius, 6, 1, 1 ff.; Livy, 26, 19; Dio Cass., 16, 39.



Adsuetus facilisque mihi: tum luce corusca, 640  
 Implebat quamquam languentia lumina somnus,  
 Vidi (crede) Iovem: nec me mutata fefellit  
 Forma dei, quod, squalentem conversus in anguem  
 Ingenti traxit curvata volumina gyro.  
 Sed mihi post partum non ultra ducere vitam  
 Concessum: heu, quantum gemui, quod spiritus ante,  
 Haec tibi quam noscenda darem, discessit in auras."

The Herculean succession, however, is most clearly brought out in what we may call *Scipio in Bivio*, when Voluptas and Virtus appear before him and he has to make his choice between them. Most significant are the words of Virtus, answering Voluptas, 15, 69 ff.:

"Quasnam iuvenem florentibus, inquit,  
 Pellicis in fraudes annis, vitaeque tenebras,  
 Cui ratio, et magnae caelestia semina mentis  
 Munere sunt concessa deum? Mortalibus alti  
 Quantum caelicolae, tantundem animalibus isti  
 Praecellunt cunctis, tribuit namque ipsa minores  
 Hos terris natura deo: sed foedere certo 75  
 Degeneres tenebris animas damnavit Avernis.  
 At, quis aetherei servatur seminis ortus,  
 Caeli porta patet, referam quid cuncta domantem  
 Amphitryoniaden? quid, cui, post Seras et Indos  
 Captivo Liber cum signa referret ab Euro, 80  
 Caucaseae currum duxere per oppida tigres?  
 Quid suspiratos magno in discrimine nautis  
 Ledaeos referam fratres, vestrumque Quirinum?  
 . . . mox celsus ab alto 106  
 Infra te cernes hominum genus. . . .  
 sed dabo, qui vestrum saevo nunc Marte fatigat 117  
 Imperium, superare manu laurumque superbam  
 In gremio Iovis excisis deponere Poenis."

It is only in the late republic that we find the basis of deification and immortality expressed by Cicero:<sup>1</sup> Neque enim est ulla res in qua propius ad deorum numen virtus accedat humana, quam civitates aut condere novas aut conservare conditas. Also:<sup>2</sup> omnibus qui patriam conservarint, adjuverint, auxerint, certum esse in caelo definitum locum, ubi beati aevo sempiterno fruuntur; nihil est enim illi

<sup>1</sup> *De Rep.* 1, 7, 12.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 6, 13.

principi deo, qui omnem mundum regit, quod quidem in terris fiat, acceptius quam concilia coetusque hominum iure sociata, quae civitates appellantur; harum rectores et conservatores hinc profecti huc revertuntur. This, says Cumont, is the republican paraphrase of the divinity of kings. In a noble passage Cicero <sup>1</sup> actually cites Hercules's conduct as the prototype of *virtus* made immortal: cogitemus denique corpus virorum fortium magnorum hominum esse mortale, animi vero motus et virtutis gloriam sempiternam; neque hanc opinionem si in illo sanctissimo Hercule consecratam videmus, cuius corpore ambusto vitam eius et virtutem immortalitas excepsisse dicatur, minus existimemus eos qui hanc tantam rem publicam suis consiliis aut laboribus aut auxerint aut defenderint aut servarint esse immortalem gloriam consecutos.

Beginning with the last century of the republic, however, the successors of Hercules are likely to be more and more composite. The civil disturbances that began with the Gracchi reared a set of giants or monsters, the quelling of which called for a new Jupiter or a new Hercules or both. The age called for a Hercules to bring peace to a warworn world; to discover or to invent an institution that would put an end to both the usurpations of the senate, exercised mostly in the passing of the *senatus consultum ultimum*, and the excesses of the populace, and this device we know now was legalized absolutism.

#### POMPEY

It was during the Roman conquests in the East, beginning with the Mithradatic wars, that her great generals began to visualize themselves, or to be visualized by their constituency, as followers of Hercules or of Alexander or of both. Such was Lucullus, but the earliest striking instance is Pompey the Great, as the following quotation from Pliny, *N. H.* 7, 95-99, shows: Verum ad decus imperii Romani, non solum ad viri unius pertinet, victoriarum Pompei Magni titulos omnes triumphosque hoc in loco nuncupari aequato non solum Alexandri Magni rerum fulgore, sed etiam Herculis prope ac Liberi Patris. (Then follows a number of valuable details.) 99. summa summarum in illa gloria fuit, ut ipse in contione dixit, cum de rebus suis dissereret,

<sup>1</sup> *Pro Sestio*, 143.

Asiam ultimam provinciarum accepisse eandemque mediam patriae reddidisse.

His remarkable record of triumphs obtained for achievements in Africa, Europe, and Asia made the comparison with Hercules obvious.<sup>1</sup> Indeed the lex Gabinia<sup>2</sup> supplemented by the lex Manilia gave him control of the world. Appian<sup>3</sup> tells us how he was interested in the lands made memorable by the Argonauts, the Dioscuri, and Hercules. He was pleased to find in this general region warriors that could be classified as Amazons,<sup>4</sup> thus following in the footsteps of Hercules, and of Alexander. Alexander's meeting with the Amazons rests on rather questionable authority.<sup>5</sup> Plutarch opens his biography of Pompey with a rather labored comparison to the effect that what Hercules was to Prometheus, Pompey<sup>6</sup> was to the Roman people — both were saviours. It is interesting to note that at Pharsalus<sup>7</sup> the watchword of the Pompeians was *Hercules invictus* over against *Venus victrix* of the Caesarians.

The Romans seem to have been much given to likening Pompey to Alexander. To both they gave the surname Magnus. Plutarch remarks:<sup>8</sup> Ἦν δέ τις καὶ ἀναστολὴ τῆς κόμης ἀτρέμα καὶ τῶν περὶ τὰ ὄμματα ῥυθμῶν ὑγρότης τοῦ προσώπου ποιοῦσα μᾶλλον λεγομένην ἢ φαινομένην ὁμοιότητα πρὸς τὰς Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ βασιλέως εἰκόνας ἧ καὶ τοῦνομα πολλῶν ἐν ἀρχῇ συνεπιφερόντων οὐκ ἔφευγεν ὁ Πομπήιος, ὥστε καὶ χλευάζοντας αὐτὸν ἐνίοις ἤδη καλεῖν Ἀλέξανδρον. Διὸ καὶ Λεύκιος Φίλιππος, ἀνὴρ ὑπατικὸς, συνηγορῶν αὐτῷ μηδὲν ἔφη ποιεῖν παράλογον, εἰ Φίλιππος ὦν φιλαλέξανδρός ἐστι.

Thus also Sallust:<sup>9</sup> Sed Pompeius a prima adulescentia sermone fautorum similem fore se credens Alexandro regi, facta consultaque eius quidem aemulus erat.

<sup>1</sup> Plut., *Pomp.* 45.

<sup>2</sup> Plut., *ibid.*, 25.

<sup>3</sup> Appian, *Mithr.* 103.

<sup>4</sup> Plut., *ibid.*, 35; Appian, *Mithr.* 103.

<sup>5</sup> Plut., *Luc.* 23; *Alex.* 46.

<sup>6</sup> For Pompey as σωτήρ the material has been presented by Wendland, *ΣΩΤΗΡ*, *Ztschr. f. d. neuest. Wissensch.* V (1904), p. 341. See also Norden, *Geburt d. Kindes*, p. 42, n. 2. For Pompey as Hercules, see Peter in Roscher's *Lexikon*, I, 2, 2918.

<sup>7</sup> Appian, *B.C.* II, 76.

<sup>8</sup> Plut., *Pomp.* 2.

<sup>9</sup> *Histories*, III frg. 88, Maurenbrecher.



Very significant are the words of Plutarch:<sup>1</sup> Αὐτὸν δέ τις ἔρως εἶχε καὶ ζῆλος Συρίαν ἀναλαβεῖν καὶ διὰ τῆς Ἀραβίας ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐρυθρὰν ἐλάσαι θάλασσαν, ὡς τῷ περιόντι τὴν οἰκουμένην πανταχόθεν Ὠκεανῷ προσμίξειε νικῶν· καὶ γὰρ ἐν Λιβύῃ πρῶτος ἄχρι τῆς ἐκτὸς Θαλάσσης κρατῶν προῆλθε, καὶ τὴν ἐν Ἰβηρίᾳ πάλιν ἀρχὴν ὠρίσατο Ῥωμαίοις τῷ Ἀτλαντικῷ πελάγει. καὶ τρίτον ἔναρχος Ἀλβανοὺς διώκων ὀλίγον ἐδέησεν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν Ὑρκανίαν Θάλασσαν.

Plutarch<sup>2</sup> shows how some of his partisans forced the parallel between him and Alexander: Ἡλικία δὲ τότε ἦν, ὡς μὲν οἱ κατὰ πάντα τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ παραβάλλοντες αὐτὸν καὶ προσβιβάζοντες ἀξιοῦσι, νεώτερος τῶν τριάκοντα καὶ τεττάρων ἐτῶν, ἀληθεία δὲ τοῖς τετταράκοντα προσῆγεν. ὡς ὦνητό γ' ἂν ἐνταῦθα τοῦ βίου παυσάμενος, ἄχρι οὗ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου τύχην ἔσχευ.

In his triumph, which he celebrated as he turned his forty-fifth year, he wore the cloak reputed to be that of Alexander the Great.<sup>3</sup>

As early as the time of the agitation of the Gabinian law, the parallel was invoked that such concentration of power meant the creation of a new Romulus, and Plutarch<sup>4</sup> tells us the following: καὶ τῶν μὲν ὑπάρχοντων ἄτερος εἰπὼν πρὸς αὐτόν, ὅτι Ῥωμύλον ζηλῶν οὐ φεύζεται ταυτόν ἐκείνῳ τέλος, ἐκινδύνευσεν ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους διαφθαρῆναι.

#### CAESAR

The next to essay the rôle of the new Heracles was Julius Caesar. There is not even a story of his birth that sets aside his human father, and makes him the immediate son of a god, as there was in the case of Hercules, Alexander, Romulus, and Scipio. He knew full well that he could become the new Heracles in the form of the king-god, only through the performance of conspicuous service to his fellowmen. Let me by anticipation recall that among other distinctions he caused a statue of himself to be set up with the inscription INVICTO DEO in the temple of Quirinus,<sup>5</sup> a situation that drew from Cicero<sup>6</sup> the bitter remark that he preferred to have him placed in the temple of Quirinus rather than in that of Salus, implying the hope that like Romulus he might be torn limb from limb by the senators rather than

<sup>1</sup> Plut., *Pomp.* 38.

<sup>2</sup> Plut., *Pomp.* 46.

<sup>3</sup> Appian, *Mithr.* 117.

<sup>4</sup> Plut., *Pomp.* 25.

<sup>5</sup> Cic., *ad Att.* 12, 47.

<sup>6</sup> Cic., *ad Att.* 12, 48.

repose safely and serenely *in Salutis*. Truly Caesar was a successor of Romulus!

But the composite picture compels us to consider him also as the successor of Heracles-Alexander. As a lad he wrote the *Laudes Herculis*, which Suetonius<sup>1</sup> tells us was one of his minor works, the publication of which Augustus forbade in a frank letter to the organizer of his libraries, Pompeius Macer. Suetonius<sup>2</sup> tells us further that while quaestor in Further Spain ubi . . . Gadis . . . venisset, animadversa apud Herculis templum Magni Alexandri imagine ingemuit et quasi pertaesus ignaviam suam, quod nihil dum a se memorabile actum esset in aetate, qua iam Alexander orbem terrarum subegisset, missionem continuo efflagitavit ad captandas quam primum rerum occasiones in urbe.<sup>3</sup> It must be admitted that he made heroic progress. Strabo<sup>4</sup> tells us that he was φιλαλέξανδρος and that he went through the same ceremonies that Alexander had performed at Troy.

The Alexander Romance<sup>5</sup> tells of a Delphic oracle prophesying world dominion to whomsoever could ride the wild horse, Bucephalas, and that Alexander succeeded in riding him. Suetonius<sup>6</sup> tells of a similar prophecy involving Caesar: cum haruspices imperium orbis terrae significare domino pronuntiassent, magna cura aluit, nec patientem sessoris alterius primus ascendit; cuius etiam instar pro aede Veneris Genetricis postea dedicavit. Of this Statius<sup>7</sup> gives another version,

Cedat equus, Latiae qui contra templa Diones  
Caesarei stat sede fori — quem traderis ausus  
Pellaeo, Lysippe, duci, mox Caesaris ora  
Mirata cervice tulit —

<sup>1</sup> Suetonius, *Julius* 56, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Suetonius, *Julius* 7. This incident seems to have been in Julian's mind when he wrote *Caesares*, 322C.

<sup>3</sup> Caesar as σωτήρ has been treated by Wendland, *op. cit.*, pp. 342 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Strabo, 13, 1, 27. In Julian, *Caesares*, 322B Alexander claims Caesar as an imitator of himself; he also remarks testily, 322C, that Caesar had come to such a pitch of shamelessness as actually to ridicule the model of his own exploits, and that at most the Romans had made only scant progress beyond the Tigris, 324C.

<sup>5</sup> *Alex. Rom.* I, 15 and 17.

<sup>6</sup> Suetonius, *Julius* 61; Cf. Pliny, *N.H.* 8, 154; Solinus, 45, 8 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Statius, *Silvae* I, 1, 84 ff.

If this reading be right, Statius charges that in an equestrian statue of Alexander by Lysippus the head of Caesar had been substituted for that of Alexander to the great astonishment of the horse. This would indeed make Caesar a successor of Alexander!

Finally the whole Roman world lay at his feet. Technically the defeat of Crassus at Carrhae needed to be avenged. Really Caesar sought to be named *rex*,<sup>1</sup> and to proceed against the Parthians was to follow the steps of Alexander. After the conquest of the Far East Caesar's plan seems to have been what Plutarch<sup>2</sup> has related in his life of him:

Τὸ μὲν πάθος οὐδὲν ἦν ἕτερον ἢ ζῆλος αὐτοῦ καθάπερ ἄλλου καὶ φιλονικία τις ὑπὲρ τῶν μελλόντων πρὸς τὰ πεπραγμένα, παρασκευὴ δὲ καὶ γνώμη στρατεύειν μὲν ἐπὶ Πάρθους, καταστρεψαμένῳ δὲ τούτους καὶ δι' Ἑρκανίας παρὰ τὴν Κασπίαν θάλασσαν καὶ τὸν Καύκασον ἐκπεριελθόντι τὸν Πόντον εἰς τὴν Σκυθικὴν ἐμβαλεῖν καὶ τὰ περὶ χώρα Γερμανοῖς καὶ Γερμανίαν αὐτὴν ἐπιδραμόντι διὰ Κελτῶν ἐπανελθεῖν εἰς Ἰταλίαν καὶ συνάψαι τὸν κύκλον τοῦτον τῆς ἡγεμονίας τῷ πανταχόθεν Ὀκεανῷ περιορισθείσης.

Had this plan been carried out, he would have been not only the son of Mars and Venus and the reincarnation of Romulus and the heir of the world empire prophesied to his descendants, but he would have equalled the remotest travels of Heracles and realized the wildest dreams of Alexander, and on the completion of these designs his deification would have followed as a matter of course. But the Ides of March ended these aspirations. However, the failure of his enemies to secure the passage of a decree of *damnatio memoriae* against his name and record prepared the way for the confirmation of all his acts, which with his successors became synonymous with consecration. Instead of the funeral pyre erected in the Campus Martius near the tomb of Julia, fate intervened and improvised a pyre in the Forum on which his mortal parts were consumed, the immortal part of him presumably ascending to heaven — a true successor of Heracles and Hephaestion. And further, Suetonius<sup>3</sup> tells us that *Siquidem ludis, quos primos consecrato ei heres Augustus edebat, stella crinita per*

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, *Lysander*, 26, tells of a somewhat similar device resorted to by Lysander to seize power.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, *Caesar* 58.

<sup>3</sup> Suet., *Jul.* 88.



septem continuos dies fulsit exoriens circa undecimam horam, creditumque est animam esse Caesaris in caelum recepti; et hac de causa simulacro eius in vertice additur stella. The star in the death scene of Alexander in the Alexander Romance<sup>1</sup> will be remembered in this connection, and also the star in the St. Petersburg cameo,<sup>2</sup> and so symbolically as well Caesar is the successor of Alexander.

#### ANTONY

Among the followers of Julius Caesar Mark Antony should be mentioned as one who essayed to play the rôle of successor to Heracles and Alexander. I say "essayed," because his succession to these two characters was limited to imitating them superficially; of their deep and fundamental significance he seems to have had no real grasp. He was also a successor of Dionysus as stated below.

In the first place he claimed descent from Anton, a son of Heracles;<sup>3</sup> it doubtless flattered him that the people thought that his features bore a resemblance to those of Heracles in his statues and paintings, and in the passage cited, Plutarch informs us that he tried to dress in keeping with the rôle. He pointed with pride to the example of Heracles, by whom his own ancestor was begotten, as one who did not confine his succession to a single womb, but gave free course to nature, thereby leaving behind him the beginnings and foundations of many families.<sup>4</sup> This was said by him in justification of the legitimization of Alexander and Cleopatra, his children by Cleopatra.<sup>5</sup> We are told<sup>6</sup> that it was Fulvia who tamed Mark Antony to endure a woman's sway, and that to her Cleopatra should have been properly grateful for having trained him so thoroughly to subservience. Indeed we are told<sup>7</sup> that "Antony, like Heracles in paintings where Omphale is seen taking away his club, and stripping off his lion's skin, was often disarmed by Cleopatra, subdued by her spells, etc." But the blunt energy and rugged honesty of Heracles were wanting.

<sup>1</sup> 3, 34; Ovid, *Met.* 15, 843 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Furtwängler, *Antike Gemmen*, vol. I, Plate LIII, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Plut., *Ant.* 4. Appian, *B. C.* 3, 16; 3, 19.

<sup>4</sup> See Pauly-Wissowa, Supplementband III, s.v. Heracles, col. 1090 ff., for Heracles's record of wives and children. For Antony as Heracles, see Roscher, I, 2, col. 2943.

<sup>5</sup> Plut., *Ant.* 36.

<sup>6</sup> Plut., *Ant.* 10.

<sup>7</sup> Plut., *Comp. of Dem. and Ant.* 3.

His succession to Alexander, however, is less remote and more significant, although in imitating Heracles he was to a certain extent imitating Alexander. For example, even as Alexander had named his son by Barsine Heracles, so Antony named his son by Cleopatra Alexander. Of the two rôles of succession played by Alexander — Heracles and Dionysus — the former has already been treated. The other rôle played by Alexander, that of Dionysus, was really more congenial to Antony.<sup>1</sup> Significant too are the portents that occurred before the defeat at Actium.<sup>2</sup> "In Patras, while Antony was staying there, the Heracleium was struck by lightning; and at Athens the Dionysus in the Battle of the Giants was dislodged by the winds and carried down into the theatre. Now, Antony associated himself with Heracles in his lineage, and with Dionysus in the mode of life which he adopted, as I have said,<sup>3</sup> and he was called the new Dionysus." That he regarded himself as the successor of Alexander, quartered in Alexandria, but ruling actually or potentially over the whole of what had been Alexander's empire is indicated by the symbolic ceremonies described by Plutarch,<sup>4</sup> a chapter full of significance: ἐμπλήσας γὰρ ὄχλου τὸ γυμνάσιον καὶ θέμενος ἐπὶ βήματος ἀργυροῦ δύο θρόνους χρυσοῦς, τὸν μὲν ἑαυτῷ τὸν δὲ Κλεοπάτρα, καὶ τοῖς παισὶν ἐτέροις ταπεινοτέρους, πρῶτον μὲν ἀπέφηνε Κλεοπάτραν βασιλίσσαν Αἰγύπτου καὶ Κύπρου καὶ Λιβύης καὶ κοίλης Συρίας, συμβασιλεύοντος αὐτῇ Καισαρίωνος, ὃς ἐκ Καίσαρος ἐδόκει τοῦ προτέρου γεγονέναι Κλεοπάτραν ἔγκυν καταλιπόντος· δεύτερον δὲ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ Κλεοπάτρας υἱοὺς βασιλεῖς βασιλέων ἀναγορεύσας, Ἀλεξάνδρῳ μὲν Ἀρμενίαν ἀπένειμε καὶ Μηδίαν καὶ τὰ Πάρθων ὅταν ὑπαγάγηται, Πτολεμαίῳ δὲ Φοινίκην καὶ Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν. ἅμα δὲ καὶ προήγαγε τῶν παίδων Ἀλέξανδρον μὲν ἐσθῆτι Μηδικῇ τιάραν καὶ κίταριν ὀρθὴν ἐχούσῃ, Πτολεμαῖον δὲ κρηπῖσι καὶ χλαμύδι καὶ καυσία κεκοσμημένον· αὕτη γὰρ ἦν σκευὴ τῶν ἀπ' Ἀλεξάνδρου βασιλέων, ἐκείνη δὲ Μήδων καὶ Ἀρμενίων. ἀσπασαμένων δὲ τῶν παίδων τοὺς γονεῖς τὸν μὲν Ἀρμενίων φυλακὴ περιέστατο τὸν δὲ Μακεδόνων.

<sup>1</sup> Plut., *Ant.* 24.

<sup>2</sup> Plut., *Ant.* 60.

<sup>3</sup> Plut., *Ant.*, 4 and 24.

<sup>4</sup> Plut., *Ant.*, 54. Cf. the version of Dion Cassius, 49, 41. The literature on the subject is cited by Ferrero, *Greatness and Decline*, III, p. 51, with the footnotes.

The symbolic significance of this ceremony, as well as of Antony's assumption of the rôle of Osiris-Dionysus and of Cleopatra as Isis-Aphrodite, has been brought out by Norden, *Geburt des Kindes*, p. 137. Norden, however, gives the impression

Most significant too are the provisions of his will <sup>1</sup> (read by Octavian before the assembled senate): ἐπεφύετο δὲ τῶν γεγραμμένων μάλιστα τῷ περὶ τῆς ταφῆς. ἐκέλευε γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα, κὰν ἐν Ῥώμῃ τελευτήσῃ, δι' ἀγορᾶς πομπευθὲν εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ὡς Κλεοπάτραν ἀποσταλῆναι. Here doubtless it would be gathered to that of Alexander and his Successors.

#### AUGUSTUS

The succession of Augustus to Heracles and to the other demigods who are sometimes grouped together in a canon is made clear by the following quotations from Horace:

C. 3, 14, 1 ff.:

Herculis ritu modo dictus, O Plebs,  
Morte venalem petiisse laurum,  
Caesar Hispana repetit Penates  
Victor ab ora.

C. 3, 3, 9 ff.:

Hac arte Pollux et vagus Hercules  
Ensis arcis attigit igneas  
Quos inter Augustus recumbens  
Purpureo bibit (*or* bibet) ore nectar.  
Hac te merentem, Bacche pater, tuae  
Vexere tigres, indocili iugum  
Collo trahentes; hac Quirinus <sup>2</sup>  
Martis equis Acheronta fugit.

Epp. 2, 1, 5 ff.:

Romulus et Liber pater et cum Castore Pollux  
Post ingentia facta deorum in templa recepti,  
Ploravere suis non respondere favorem  
Speratum meritis. Diram qui contudit hydram  
Notaque fatali portenta labore subegit,  
Comperit invidiam supremo fine domari.

9

that the concept Alexander-Helios is a new one. This is of course by no means the case. See Schreiber, *Studien über das Bildnis Alexanders d. Grossen*, pp. 124 f. We could wish that the information concerning Alexander-Helios were fuller.

<sup>1</sup> Plut., *Ant.* 58.

<sup>2</sup> Augustus as a successor of Romulus has been fully treated by Kenneth Scott, *The Identification of Augustus with Romulus-Quirinus*, in *Trans. Am. Phil. Assn.*, LVI (1925), pp. 82 ff.



C. 4, 5, 31 ff.: (addressed to Augustus):

Hinc ad vina redit laetus et alteris  
Te mensis adhibet deum;  
Te multa prece, te prosequitur mero  
Defuso pateris et Laribus tuum  
Miscet numen, uti Graecia Castoris  
Et magni memor Herculis.<sup>1</sup>

No argument is needed to interpret the pertinent features of these passages: the traditional *σωτῆρες* together with their conspicuous services to humanity are given, and to their number Augustus is added, as being really more blessed than any one of them in not having to wait until after death for the guerdon of deification. The absence of the name of Alexander is significant, and will be considered later in connection with similar passages to be cited.

*CIL.* XIV. 3665, 3681, 3679, 3679a show that at Tibur the cult of Augustus was joined directly to that of Hercules; likewise at Grumentum, *CIL.* X, 320.<sup>2</sup>

*Oceanus and the Cosmic Serpent.*

Inasmuch as this paper includes the study of its several heroes in their capacity as *κοσμοκράτορες*, the symbolism of Oceanus and the cosmic serpent is herewith presented in its main phases. In Homer's description of the shield of Achilles the River Oceanus encircles the outermost rim of the shield, thus including all the activities pictured within it, and symbolically inclosing the *orbis terrarum*, *Iliad* 18, 607-8:

ἐν δ' ἐτίθει ποταμοῖο μέγα σθένος Ὠκεανοῖο  
ἄντυγα παρ' πυμάτην σάκεος πύκα ποιητοῖο.

Oceanus is found in a similar position and with the same symbolical significance in Hesiod's description of the shield of Heracles, *Aspis* 314-5:

<sup>1</sup> Here should be added Tacitus, *Ann.* 4, 38, 5, where the senate views with disfavor Tiberius's refusal to be deified: Optimos quippe mortalium altissima cupere: sic Herculem et Liberum apud Graecos, Quirinum apud nos deum numero additos, melius Augustum, qui speravit.

In Horace, *C.* 1, 12, the demigods are not so clearly distinguished.

<sup>2</sup> For the Roman emperors after Augustus who were identified with Hercules see Peter in Roscher's *Lexicon*, I, 2987 ff.

ἀμφὶ δ' ἵτυν ῥέεν Ὠκεανὸς πλήθοντι ἑοικώς.  
 πᾶν δὲ συνείχε σάκος πολυδαίδαλον.

Oceanus resembling a serpent was thus easily merged with the oriental conception of the cosmic serpent. When the world was represented as flat, the serpent would like Oceanus encircle the outer edge; when the world came to be represented and symbolized by a sphere, the serpent would be represented as encircling the terrestrial globe or the cosmic sphere. In either representation, however, the cosmic serpent symbolized world dominion. I cite therefore the *Alex. Rom.* I, 11: ὄρνις ἡμερος νεοττὸς εἰς τοὺς κόλπους αὐτοῦ (sc. Φιλίππου) ἀλλομένη ἔτεκεν ὦόν, ὃ κατακυλισθὲν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐρράγη. ἀφ' οὗ ἐξεπήδησε μικρὸν δρακόντιον· κυκλώσαν δὲ τὸ ὦόν, ὅθεν ἐξῆλθε, καὶ εἰσελθεῖν βουλόμενον, πρὶν βαλεῖν ἔσω τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐτελεύτησεν. . . . The seer Antiphon interpreted the incident to Philip as follows: 'Τίός σοι ἔσται, ὃς βασιλεύσει καὶ περιελεύσεται τὸν ὅλον κόσμον, τῇ ἰδίᾳ δυνάμει πάντας ὑποτάσσων· οὗτος δὲ εἰς τὰ ἰδία συστρέφων ὀλιγοχρόνιος τελευτήσει. ὁ γὰρ δράκων βασιλικὸν ἔστι ζῶον, τὸ δὲ ὦόν παραπλήσιον κόσμῳ, ὅθεν ὁ δράκων ἐξήει. . . .' To this should be added the passage from the Syrian version, I, 30, quoted on p. 21. Similarly, when Alexander makes his celestial voyage, he sees the Ocean like a serpent serving as the outer boundary of the world; 2, 41 in L and C; *Leo Neap.* III, 27 II, 5 Pfister.

If we pass to our Roman heroes, Pompey sought to bring his victorious career of conquest in touch with the Ocean (Plut. *Pomp.* 38, quoted on p. 39), and Plutarch credits a similar goal to Caesar (*Caes.* 58, quoted on p. 41). Herewith should be compared Verg. *Aen.* I, 286-7:<sup>1</sup>

Nascetur pulcra Troianus origine Caesar,  
 Imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris.

On the patera of Boutae, in the centre of which is found the portrait of Augustus, the cosmic serpent passes around close to the edge, inclosing all the details represented.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Recent editors refer this to Augustus rather than to Julius. See however Gundolf, *Caesar*, Berlin, 1924, p. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Deonna, *Le Trésor des Fins d'Annecy* in *Rev. Arch.* IX (1920), pp. 126, 130ff. Deonna calls attention to the serpent encircling the sphere in the deification of Antoninus and Faustina, and to the article 'Sterne' in Roscher. I have added these instances from the Alexander Romance and from Pompey and Caesar.

The child of Vergil's Fourth Eclogue is one of the successors of Heracles. In the light of Norden's brilliant book, *Die Geburt des Kindes*, which has treated the many-sided significance of that inspired work, I hope that I may not be regarded as utterly presumptuous in bringing forward my own opinions concerning its setting and interpretation, some of which had occurred to me before reading his book, while again others have been suggested by it. I still feel with Skutsch and many other scholars that it is preferable to regard Horace's Sixteenth Epode as having stimulated Vergil to the writing of the Eclogue, and that it was Vergil's optimism that supplied the hope amid the gloom. Horace had counselled withdrawal to the far off isles of the western ocean, where presumably the Golden Age was thought still to persist without degeneration; Vergil found it expedient to foretell a restoration of it to the land of Saturn. But the Eclogue was more remotely an answer also to Catullus<sup>1</sup> in whom he had read:

Currite ducentes subtegmina, currite fusi.

a line of which the author of the *Ciris*,<sup>2</sup> whether Vergil or some one else, had already shown reminiscence:

Concordes stabili firmarunt numine Parcae, etc.,

and which is reflected also in *Ecl.* 4, 46-7:

"Talia saecula" suis dixerunt "currite" fusi  
Concordes stabili fatorum numine Parcae.

In fact the Eclogue rings like a solemn correction or even rebuke to the thought found at the end of Catullus's poem, especially the concluding lines, 404 ff.:

Omnia fanda nefanda malo permixta furore  
Iustificam nobis mentem avertere deorum,  
Quare nec talis dignantur visere coetus,  
Nec se contingi patiuntur lumine claro.

But Vergil, instead of granting that the gods had permanently withdrawn from participation in the human affairs of this crime-ridden world, was strong in his hope for a return of the virgin Astraea and of the Golden Age. The closing line of the Eclogue:

<sup>1</sup> Catullus, 64, 327.

<sup>2</sup> *Ciris*, 125.



qui non risere parenti,  
Nec deus hunc mensa, dea nec dignata cubili est,

is more obviously to be interpreted as a reminiscence of Homer, *Od.* 11, 601 f.:<sup>1</sup>

τὸν δὲ μετ' εἰσενόησα βίην Ἡρακλεΐην,  
εἶδωλον· αὐτὸς δὲ μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι  
τέρπεται ἐν θαλίῃσιν καὶ ἔχει καλλίσφυρον Ἥβην.

and prepares us to think of the coming saviour in terms of a new Heracles.<sup>2</sup> But after all Vergil's closest contacts were with Theocritus. The picture of Alexander and Ptolemy Soter exalted to heaven as paladins of Heracles in 17, 13-33, could not fail to have impressed him, when he penned such lines as 15 ff.:

Ille deum vitam accipiet, divisque videbit  
Permixtos heroas et ipse videbitur illis,  
Pacatumque reget patriis virtutibus orbem.

But even closer to the Fourth Eclogue than the Seventeenth Idyll is the Twenty-fourth Idyll entitled "Heraciscus." In this, after the ten months' babe, Heracles, has strangled the serpents, Tiresias utters the prophecy (79 ff., already quoted on p. 10 above) foretelling the age of idyllic peace — almost a Golden Age — that the Hero was to bring to pass on earth. The motif of the *Tierfriede* sounded by Theocritus in 90-91 Vergil utilized as early as *Ecl.* 5, 60:

Nec lupus insidiae pecori nec retia cervis  
Ulla dolum meditantur,

a passage that probably antedates Horace, *Epode*, 16, 31-34 (cf. also *Ecl.* 8, 27).

But in the Fourth Eclogue Vergil essayed *paulo maiora*. Instead of foretelling the training, achievements, and deification of the babe Heracles *ex eventu*, as Theocritus did, he made a prophecy of one (presumably) not yet born, one who by the way has never been satisfactorily identified, for the reason that no babe born near to that time

<sup>1</sup> Norden, *op. cit.*, p. 68, cites three similar passages from Pindar.: *N.* I, 69; I, 3 (4), 58; I, 5 (6), 24.

<sup>2</sup> The same view was put forth by Kukula, *Röm. Säkularpoesie*. Reinach in the *Rev. de l'histoire des Religions*, XLII, p. 365 ff. explained the *puer* as the son of Jupiter appearing as the new Dionysus.

brought Vergil's prophecy to fulfillment. He who restored Astraea and the Golden Age proved to be none other than Augustus himself, and Augustus trod in the steps of Heracles, of Alexander, not to mention Romulus and Caesar; and the empire that Augustus founded was one conceived along messianic lines and it was the realization of the ideal of Alexander.

The signs attending the birth of the child would be in keeping with his high destiny, lines 50 ff.:

Aspice convexo nutantem pondere mundum  
Terrasque tractusque maris caelumque profundum,  
Aspice venturo ut laetentur omnia saeclo.

What have the scenes at the birth of Heracles and Alexander to compare with this? At the birth of Heracles described at the end of Plautus, *Amphitruo*, which clearly took place at night, we find the maid Bromia thus describing what happened, 1055 ff.:

ita mihi videntur omnia, mare terra caelum consequi,

1063 strepitus, crepitus, sonitus, tonitrus; ut subito, ut propere ut valide  
tonuit!

1087 ardere censui aedes; ita tum confulgebant;

and the latter thought is repeated at 1094 ff.:

tum ibi continuo contonat  
sonitu maximo, aedis primo ruere rebamur tuas.  
aedes totae confulgebant tuae, quasi essent aureae.

When Jupiter in line 1123 has announced that it is his son who has killed the serpents,—whereat Amphitruo sets out to consult Tiresias, Jupiter actually makes his epiphany and says, 1139 ff.:

Eorum alter, nostro quist susceptust semine,  
suis factis te immortalī adficiet gloria.

Note that Jupiter modestly passes on the glory of the achieving such a son to Amphitruo.

Such a scene as this supplied the groundwork for the description of the birth of Alexander in the Alexander Romance, and in this connection let me recall what has been set forth above, namely, that the author of the Alexander Romance portrayed his hero in the main as

a second Heracles. First, let me quote the Latin version of Julius Valerius, I, xii (6), Nectanebus:

Ac tum demum acrius intuens cursus astrorum motusque elementorum cognoscit iam omnem mundum vim suam in summo culmine conversionis lene librasse solemque ipsum mediam caeli plagam et convexi celsiora percurrere. Tunc ergo ad mulierem sic ait: "En tempus est," inquit, "voce nunc fortiore opus est et obfirmatiore conatu, quippe quod nunc erit editum, mundi totius dominio celebrabitur." His femina incitata mugitu omni vehementius ingemiscens exegit puerum, qui ubi ad humum lapsus est, motus protinus terrae insequitur et tonitruum crepor ventorumque conflictus, tum etiam fulgorum coruscatio; prorsus ut viseres omni mundo curam cum illa partitidine elaboratam.<sup>1</sup>

Finally there is the pivotal line of the whole poem, 49:

Cara deum suboles, magnum Iovis incrementum,

with which should be closely compared *Ciris*, 398:

Cara Iovis suboles, magnum Iovis incrementum,

here referring to the Dioscuri, Castor and Pollux. In each line the first part is perfectly clear; for in the passage from the *Ciris* the Dioscuri are clearly the sons of Jupiter, whereas in the Eclogue the poet is non-committal by his use of *deum*. Before proceeding to the discussion of the second part of the line let me observe that in the pagan world of Greece and Rome the highest goal that could be hoped for was that one's achievement would be so great that by common consent the performer would be spoken of as the offspring of a god, and that in recognition of this he would be added as a new deity to the ranks of the Olympians. It is unfortunate that the phrase, *magnum Iovis incrementum*, has often been translated "great seed of a Jupiter to be." This is the interpretation of the great scholar, Munro, who arrived at it through what cannot now be regarded as anything else than the forcing of the parallel, Ovid *Met.* 3, 102:

Vipereos dentes, populi incrementa futuri,

<sup>1</sup> I have not been able to see, except in reviews and summaries, Boll's discussion of these astrological elements found in his *Sulla quarta ecloga di Virgilio*, in *Mem. Acad. Bologna*, 1923.

The B Manuscript represents Alexander as born by night. In the others the sun is at its zenith *μεσουρανῶν*. In the Armenian, the birth takes place under *Κρόνος*; in A and Syrian the signs are Aquarius and Pisces under which Zeus, Ammon, Bel, and Dionysus also were born.



an expression used of the dragon's teeth, and Curtius 5, 6, 42; *magno-rum praefectorum et ducum haec sunt incrementa et rudimenta*, an expression used of the sons of the Macedonian chieftains.<sup>1</sup> To interpret the Dioscuri of the *Ciris* or the babe of the Fourth Eclogue as embryo Jupiters would entail an over-production of Jupiters, and create a situation utterly abhorrent to any proper conception of Jupiter, as for example given by Horace, *C.* 1, 12, 17 ff.:

Unde nil maius generatur ipso,  
Nec viget quicquam simile aut secundum.

Norden<sup>2</sup> has given a good discussion of the semantics of *incrementum*; Anwuchs, Zuwachs, Wachstum, Nachwachs, and he correctly cites *augmentum* as synonymous with *incrementum*. *Augmentum* may be an increase produced by generation, i.e., *offspring*, *scion*, and it may equally well be an addition made to any thing or quality; and herewith I cite several passages from Julius Valerius, p. 10, 22 Kuebl.—sed enim Antiphon ad incrementum peritiae suae; 45, 21 non ut opibus suis indidem incrementi aliquid pareretur; 53, 10 quin ergo errata corrige nec addas facinoribus huiusmodi incrementum; 62, 14, quippe (Darius) illum incrementis bellicae rei audiebat quotidie sublimari; 86, 22, tot victoriis doctus nil aliud nisi de incremento vestrae gloriae cogitaverim.

In view of such usages as these, I may well raise the question whether in *CIL.* X, 1, pp. 580–81: ex quorum reditu quotannis daretur pueris, curiae incrementis, should be translated as Mayor<sup>3</sup> suggests “boys who would hereafter constitute (or compose) the town council,” or “boys who are the offspring of decurions” (Frank),<sup>4</sup> but rather “boys who would hereafter *be added* to the town council.” My own conclusion is in harmony with the last suggestion, and is identical with that of Skutsch,<sup>5</sup> who interprets *incrementum Iovis* as an accession to Jupiter, or, more concretely, one who supports him in his work, and is therefore destined *to be added* to the ranks of the dwellers on Olympus by deification, and this whether he might be the son of Jupiter, as

<sup>1</sup> See the edition of Müttzell and his note *ad loc.*

<sup>2</sup> Norden, *op. cit.*, p. 129 f.

<sup>3</sup> Mayor, *Virgil's Messianic Eclogue*, p. 139.

<sup>4</sup> Frank, *Class. Phil.* XI (1916), 334 f.

<sup>5</sup> Skutsch, *Gallus u. Vergil*, p. 82.

were Heracles, Dionysus, the Dioscuri, or the son of Apollo, as was Augustus. And in view of such considerations we should not (with Robinson Ellis) cite as parallel *Aen.* 9, 642:

dis genite et geniture deos,

but rather *Aen.* 8, 301 (words addressed by Evander to Hercules):

Salve vera Iovis proles, decus *addite divis*.

And the same idea, that is, of an addition made to the divine ranks, perhaps a reminiscence of the last passage just quoted from Vergil and of line 49 of the Eclogue, is to be found in Livy, 1, 7, 10, which also are Evander's words to Hercules: *Iove nate Hercules*, inquit, *te mihi mater veridica interpres deum, aucturum caelestium numerum cecinit.*

With reference therefore to the *puer* this study accepts the view of Kukula<sup>1</sup> that he was conceived after the fashion of Heracles and Alexander, and that *incrementum* means *augmentum* or *accession*, as first suggested by Skutsch.

For nearly a decade after the Peace of Brundisium and the Fourth Eclogue the Roman world waited in vain for its saviour and world-ruler, but with the issue of Actium it found both in Octavian, soon to be named Augustus. The consummation of these great events finds its expression in Vergil's triumphant lines, *Aen.* 6, 791 ff.:

Hic vir, hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis,  
Augustus Caesar, Divi genus, aurea condet  
Saecula qui rursus Latio regnata per arva  
Saturno quondam; super et Garamantas et Indos  
Proferet imperium; iacet extra sidera tellus,  
Extra anni solisque vias, ubi caelifer Atlas  
Axem umero torquet stellis ardentibus aptum.  
Huius in adventum iam nunc et Caspia regna  
Responsis horrent divum et Maïotia tellus,  
Et septemgemini turbant trepida ostia Nili.  
Nec vero Alcides tantum telluris obivit,  
Fixerit aëripedem cervam licet, aut Erymanthi  
Pacarit nemora, et Lernam tremefecerit arcu;  
Nec qui pampineis victor iuga flectit habenis,  
Liber agens celso Nysae de vertice tigres.

800

<sup>1</sup> *Römische Säkularpoesie*, pp. 50-3, 60, 67, 83 ff.

In an argument based mainly on rhetorical grounds Norden has shown reason for believing that the passage has derived its form from the traditional Alexander encomium.<sup>1</sup> Before I had read his article I had come to a similar conclusion on the basis of the historical and mythological arguments presented in this paper. Silius Italicus seems to have had this Vergilian passage in mind when he introduced Alexander, 13, 762 ff.:

Hic ille est, tellure vagus qui victor in omni  
Cursu signa tulit, cui pervia Bactra Dahaeque,  
Qui Gangen bibit et Pellaeo ponte Niphaten  
Adstrinxit, cui stant sacro sua moenia Nilo.

Even in the rhetorical field there are a few points on which Norden's argument can be supplemented. It was a rhetorical necessity that a writer of a *σύγκρισις* should make out his hero to be superior to the heroes of former times to whom he compared him. Thus Lucretius at the beginning of the Fifth Book represents Epicurus<sup>2</sup> as having con-

<sup>1</sup> E. Norden in *Rhein. Mus.* LIV (1899), p. 468 ff. Norden's view has been accepted by Kampers, *op. cit.*, p. 42-2; W. Hoffmann, *Literarische Porträt*, p. 33-5; H. Christensen, *Alexander der grosse bei den römischen Dichtern*, in *Neue Jahrbücher f.d. klassische Altertum*, XXIII (1909) pp. 107 ff.; Kukula in his *Römische Säkularpoesie*; it has been rejected by Elter, *op. cit.*, p. 40, 42 and 40, 52. In pure formalism — which was based on Roman native pride and the fiction of their descent, especially that of the Julii from Romulus, Mars, Aeneas and Venus — Elter is of course right, but in historical reality he is wrong. Augustus was the successor of both Romulus and Alexander.

Gundolf, *Caesar*, p. 26, says "Man gehorchte dem Augustus, man träumte von Alexander . . . man opferte dem Divus Julius."

Augustus's appreciation of Alexander was most genuine. With Vergil's omission of the name Alexander and the substitution of Augustus therefor may be compared the act of Claudius in having the head of Augustus substituted for that of Alexander in the two paintings mentioned by Pliny, *N.H.* 35, 92-94: (Apelles) pinxit Alexandrum magnum fulmen tenentem in Templo Ephesiae Dianae . . . digiti eminere videntur et fulmen extra tabulam esse . . . mirantur eius . . . Romae Castorem et Pollucem cum Victoria et Alexandro Magno, item Belli imaginem restrictis a tergo manibus, Alexandro in curru triumphante, quas utrasque tabulas divus Augustus in fori sui celeberrimis partibus dicaverat simplicitate moderata divus Claudius pluris existimavit utrique excisa Alexandri facie divi Augusti imagines addere.

<sup>2</sup> On Epicurus as the recipient of divine honors both during his lifetime and after, see Wendland, *op. cit.*, p. 346 ff., especially notes 3 and 4; Deneken in Roscher I, 2, col. 2534 f.



tributed greater benefits on the human race than Hercules, and in our passage under discussion Vergil represents Augustus as having traversed a greater area of the earth than did either Hercules or Dionysus. Quite innocently these authors were preparing the way for *συγκρίσεις* to be made a century later in which Martial compares Domitian with Hercules to the great disadvantage of the latter, in fact our hero becomes *Alcides minor*, and the statue of him set up in his temple by Domitian was made in representation of the emperor's features.<sup>1</sup> In like manner Statius, *Silvae*, 4, 3, 153 ff.:

Iuravit tibi iam nivalis Arctus,  
Nunc magnos Oriens dabit triumphos,  
*Ibis qua vagus Hercules et Euhan*  
*Ultra sidera flammeumque solem*  
Et Nili caput et nives Atlantis, etc.

Where Augustus is represented as having gone *extra sidera*, *extra anni solisque vias* (795-6), Q. Curtius represents the soldiers of Alexander as refusing *trahi extra sidera et solem cogique adire, quae mortalium oculis natura subduxerit*, etc. (9, 4, 18).<sup>2</sup> In the funeral oration in honor of Augustus which Dio Cassius puts in the mouth of Tiberius is found the following interesting *σύγκρισις*:

ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐπιβουλευθέντος αὐτοῦ (sc. Καίσαρος) πάντα τὰ κοινὰ ἐταράχθη τῷ τε πατρὶ ἅμα ἱκανῶς ἐτιμώρησε καὶ ὑμῖν ἀναγκαίως ἐπεκούρησε, μήτε τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐχθρῶν φοβηθεὶς μήτε τὸ μέγεθος τῶν πραγμάτων δέσας μήτε τὴν ὀλιγοετίαν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ὀκνήσας. καίτοι τί τοιοῦτον ἢ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μακεδῶν ἢ Ῥωμύλος ὁ ἡμέτερος, οἵπερ που μάλιστα νεαροὶ ὄντες ἐλλόγιμον τι ποιῆσαι δοκοῦσιν, ἔπραξαν; ἀλλὰ τούτους μὲν ἑάσω, ἵνα μὴ καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ παραβάλλειν οἱ καὶ παραδεικνύναι σφᾶς, καὶ ταῦτα ἐν ὑμῖν μηδὲν ἥττον ἐμοῦ αὐτοὺς εἰδόσι, σμικροτέραν τὴν τοῦ Αὐγούστου ἀρετὴν ποιεῖν νομισθῶ· πρὸς μόνον δὲ δὴ τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ τὰ ἐκείνου ἔργα παραθεωρῶν αὐτὸν ὀρθῶς μὲν ἂν κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιεῖν δόξαιμι, τοσοῦτον δ' ἂν τῆς προαιρέσεως διαμάρτοίμι ὅσον ἐκείνος μὲν ἔν τε παισὶν ὄφεις καὶ ἐν ἀνδράσι ἔλαφόν τε τινα καὶ κάπρον καὶ νῆ Δία καὶ λέοντα ἄκων καὶ ἐξ ἐπιτάξεως

<sup>1</sup> Martial, IX, 64, 65, 101.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Seneca, *Ep. Mor.* 94, 63 (Alexander) it tamen ultra Oceanum solemque indignatur ab Herculis Liberique vestigiis victoriam flectere. Cf. Aeschines, 3, 165: ὁ δ' Ἀλέξανδρος ἔξω τῆς ἄρκτου καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὀλίγου δεῖν πάσης μεθιστήκει.

ἀπέκτεινεν, οὗτος δὲ οὐκ ἐν θηρίοις ἀλλ' ἐν ἀνδράσιν ἐθελόντης καὶ πολέμων καὶ νομοθετῶν τό τε κοινὸν ἀκριβῶς ἔσωσε καὶ αὐτὸς ἐλαμπρύνθη.<sup>1</sup>

It has become recognized within the past generation that the Roman empire was in essence the realization of the ideal of Alexander. The Romans knew well that they were his political and cultural heirs, even though they did not specifically say so. In fact they realized it so fully that they spoke of themselves as though they were his geographical heirs as well. This is the reason that in imperial literature we find such terms as *Medi*, *Persi*, *Indi*, *Seres* used. In our editions of the classical authors the notes tell us that these are general terms for *eastern* or *oriental*; they do not however tell us that these terms would hardly have been used then had it not been for Alexander and his cult — the aspiration of the Roman emperors to grow up to his stature. The extreme instance of this hyperbole is to be found in Servius, *ad Aen.* I, 292: *nam cum de Gangaridum victoria diceret* (sc. Vergilius) *qui iuxta Gangen sunt et ab Augusto victi sunt*.<sup>2</sup>

Strangely enough Augustus, who arose as the new Heracles, and as the champion of Italy in the form of the deified Romulus, was also the successor of Alexander and a votary of the new Alexander cult. He spared Alexandria, and visited reverently the tomb of Alexander, placing upon it a golden crown and flowers. The Ptolemies he did not wake from their slumbers, suffering them to rest on in peace, saying that he desired to see a king, not corpses.<sup>3</sup> He caused two paintings of Alexander by Apelles to be placed conspicuously in the Forum, on both of which Claudius later caused the head of Alexander to be replaced by that of Augustus.<sup>4</sup> At one period he employed the image of Alexander on his seal;<sup>5</sup> and even as Alexander received embassies from the peoples of the West on his return from the far East to Babylon, just so Augustus prided himself on receiving embassies from the

<sup>1</sup> Dio Cassius, 56, 36, 2 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps Vergil himself prepared the way for this exaggeration by his words in *Georg.* 3, 26-27:

In foribus pugnam ex auro solidoque elephanto  
Gangaridum faciam victorisque arma Quirini.

<sup>3</sup> Suetonius, *Aug.* 18.

<sup>4</sup> Pliny, *N.H.* 35, 92-94, see note 1, p. 53.

<sup>5</sup> Suetonius, *Aug.* 50; Pliny, *N.H.* 37, 10.

peoples of the East.<sup>1</sup> By a curious coincidence we are informed by Strabo that the name of one of these kings was Porus.<sup>2</sup>

Kampers<sup>3</sup> says that the first who consciously utilized the tradition of Alexander to political ends, was, as far as we know, Vergil. From the picture of the great Macedonian he borrowed the coloring for his description of the messianic empire of Augustus. He goes on to say that the report of a messianic return of Alexander would not be hushed, and that Vergil therefore sought to remove the foundation for it by transferring it to Augustus whose glories he sang. A pertinent passage is *Aen.* 8, 678 ff., dealing with the battle of Actium and its significance:

Hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar  
cum patribus populoque, penetibus et magnis dis,  
stans celsa in puppi; geminas cui tempora flammās  
laeta vomunt, patriumque aperitur vertice sidus.

The scene is one of striking solemnity and significance. Speaking *ex eventu*, Vergil could take victory as assured and recognize that civil wars and waste were over and that Greco-Roman civilization was now safe. "Patriumque aperitur vertice sidus" marks him as the heir and successor of Julius, a sign which I have<sup>4</sup> given reason to believe really goes back to Alexander himself and was adopted from him by the Ptolemies. What about

geminas cui tempora flammās  
laeta vomunt?

Servius explained them as referring to the brightness of Augustus's eyes. Modern commentators, as for example Heyne, see here a remi-

<sup>1</sup> *Res Gestae*, 31; cf. Arrian, *Anab.* 7, 19; Diod. 17, 113.

<sup>2</sup> Strabo, 15, 1, 4 (text doubtful); 15, 1, 73.

<sup>3</sup> Kampers, *op. cit.*, p. 41; cf. H. Christensen, in the introduction to his article, *Alexander der grosse bei den römischen Dichtern*, in *Neue Jahrbücher f.d. klassische Altertum*, XXIII (1909), pp. 107 ff.:

"Die Feststellung seiner Monarchie und die Form, in die er seine Herrscherstellung gekleidet hatte, war es, die den römischen Kaisern seit Cäsar und Augustus das Vorbild lieferte und sie veranlasste, sich mit ihm in Vergleich zu stellen und seine Gottähnlichkeit ihm nachzumachen. Ja schliesslich verkörperte sich in ihm in Verbindung mit den römischen Reichsgedanken die Hoffnung auf einen Messias, der die Welt von allen Leiden und Nöten wieder erlösen sollte."

<sup>4</sup> See above pp. 26-28.



niscence of passages in the *Iliad* in which a hero<sup>1</sup> had the favor of Athena who made their helmets shine with the brightness of the metal. Henry, however, has shown that in all probability Augustus was bare-headed, and therefore without a metal helm to shine. Deonna<sup>2</sup> explains the phenomenon by identifying Augustus with Apollo-Helios, whose sign was a *corona radiata* — a sign which also characterized the Seleucids. This seems to be correct, as far as it goes, but does not explain *geminas*. May not the situation show that just as Augustus inherited the *Caesaris astrum*, so Vergil meant that he should inherit also the horns of Alexander made luminous?<sup>3</sup>

In the course of time there grew up around Augustus's name stories that seem to align him with Alexander. Most of these are told by Suetonius, and his legend has been studied in detail by Deonna.<sup>4</sup> The most striking element of similarity is that of his conception: to his mother as she was undergoing incubation in the temple of Apollo, the god appeared in the form of a serpent,<sup>5</sup> as the marks on her body seemed

<sup>1</sup> Diomede, 5, 4 ff.; Achilles, 18, 206-14, 225-227; 22, 26-29, 134-35.

<sup>2</sup> *Le Trésor des Fins d'Annecy*. in *Rev. Arch.* XI (1920), p. 186.

<sup>3</sup> The case of Moses descending from Mt. Sinai (*Exodus*, XXIV, 29, 30, 35) is interesting, by way of comparison. The Hebrew word which describes the face of Moses is susceptible of two meanings, *radiant* and *horned*. The Septuagint gives *δέδοξασται*, which translates the former; Jerome in the *Vulgate* gives *cornutam*, which translates the latter. Jerome hardly intended that his rendering should be taken literally, and did not specify the number of horns, but left it easily to be inferred that there were two. Such was the interpretation given the passage by Michelangelo in his Statue of Moses in San Pietro in Vincoli. The horns in being translated into marble lost their luminosity. If my interpretation of the Vergilian passage be correct, Vergil reversed the process by making luminous the two horns of Alexander.

<sup>4</sup> Suet., *Augustus*, 94. Deonna, *La Légende d'Octave-Auguste*, in *Rev. de l'histoire des religions*, LXXXIII and LXXXIV (1921).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Dio Cassius, 45, 1, 2, which is undoubtedly based on the passage in Suetonius. Apollinaris Sidonius actually brings Alexander and Augustus together in the manner of their conception, 2, 121 ff.:

Magnus Alexander nec non Augustus habentur  
Concepti serpente deo, Phoebumque Iovemque  
Divisere sibi; namque horum quaesiit unus  
Cinyfia sub Syrte patrem, maculis genetricis  
Alter Phoebigenum sese gaudebat haberi,  
Paeonii iactans Epidauria signa dracontis.

to indicate. Octavius was leading an army through Thrace, and in the grove of Liber he inquired about the destiny of his son. In the sacrifice a pillar of fire sprang forth from the wine and mounted even to the sky, a phenomenon that had occurred to no one else, so the priests said, since Alexander himself made sacrifices at the same altar. Augustus was also credited with imitating Alexander in the knitting of his brow, and in the inclination of his head toward the left shoulder, this in imitation of the Diadochi. The eagle that perched on the first letter of his name was interpreted as giving notice that Jupiter would claim him back.

## THE DANAOS

BY LEICESTER B. HOLLAND

UNLETTERED monuments show the fabric of civilizations, lettered ones present historic facts, and, on a web of one and the other, literature embroiders legend, myth, and moral commentary.<sup>1</sup> Creation myths and hero tales which thus result are commonly regarded by students of primitive peoples as of little value save for their evidence on ethnic and religious subjects. But along with such material there have been sometimes found chronologies of kings, and these have for the most part been shown, by progressive discoveries in the ancient East, to be of true historic substance.

The many compilations of this sort which have come to light among the remarkably preserved remains of Egypt and Mesopotamia have pushed back history almost to the beginnings of civilization there, but in Greece our earliest epigraphic monuments scarcely appear before the sixth century B.C. Even for that period our "history" is largely built on somewhat later literature. So, while we know the civilization of Greece in considerable detail, from its material remains, for two millennia or more before the times within the immediate memories of the fifth-century Greek historians, yet, since we have no written records of demonstrably older date, these earlier centuries are perforce called "prehistoric."

Nevertheless, it may safely be claimed that some authentic historical material relating to prehistoric Greece must have been in existence in classic times. For the excavations of Egypt and Mesopotamia warrant us in concluding generally that wherever a cult centre of importance flourished for any long period, there a well-organized, self-perpetuating priestly college would be found, which in turn, as one of its natural functions, would inevitably produce and preserve a local chronicle. In Greece the harsher climate and more perishable forms

<sup>1</sup> I desire to express my sincerest thanks to Dr. Carl W. Blegen for the benefit of his expert criticism on prehistoric matters, and for information in advance of publication regarding his recent illuminating excavations at the Heraeum.



of document have prevented anything of the sort from reaching us in its original state. But we know that the historic cults of Delphi and Eleusis go back without a break to prehistoric worship of the Great Mother,<sup>1</sup> that the Erechtheum was the heart of religious worship in Athens from legendary days,<sup>2</sup> and that the Argive Heraeum — the sacred centre in classic times of the whole Argolid — continued a pre-Dorian cult<sup>3</sup> that had been only slightly colored by the Olympians; and we can hardly doubt that all these shrines had once their priestly records of high antiquity, or that one of the earliest uses of writing in Greece was to preserve these chronicles.<sup>4</sup>

This *a priori* probability is reinforced by good, though indirect, parallel evidence. The Erechtheum, Pausanias tells us,<sup>5</sup> held a series of portraits of the priestly family of the Butads, who apparently traced an unbroken genealogy back to Butes. Since Butes was said to have been the twin brother of Erechtheus, who lived, according to Athenian chronology, about 1400 B.C., it is to be supposed that the Butads preserved some sort of records, already very old in classic times, running back as far as Erechtheus at least; and in fact the pseudo-Plutarch<sup>6</sup> says that there was a genealogical table of the priests of Poseidon dedicated in the Erechtheum. Like the portraits of the Butads, statues of the priestesses of Hera, whose consecration served as the basis of Argolic chronology, stood before the Argive Heraeum.<sup>7</sup> How old these were, we do not know, but the records of

<sup>1</sup> Delphi: *B. C. H.*, XLVI (1922), pp. 506-508; *Fouilles de Delphes*, Vol. II, fasc. 5, Sanctuaire d'Athéna Pronaia. Eleusis: cf. Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Eleusis*, pp. 248-251. The Athenian traditions (*Marmor Parium* ep. 12-15, ll. 23-28) place the foundation of the Eleusinian cults about 1400 B.C. Excavations have disclosed remains of a "telesterion" and enclosing wall of the sanctuary which may be pre-Hellenic constructions. See Philios, *Eleusis*, plan, *r*, *h*. Cf. Nilsson, *Minoan-Mycenaean Religion*, pp. 400-411.

<sup>2</sup> Holland, *Erechtheum Papers*, *A. J. A.*, XXVIII (1924), *passim*.

<sup>3</sup> Waldstein, *Argive Heraeum*, I, pp. 5-8; II, p. 14.

<sup>4</sup> The curious title *λογογράφοι*, used by the Greeks for their earliest chroniclers, is suggestive.

<sup>5</sup> I, 26, 5.

<sup>6</sup> *Vit. X Orat.*, *Life of Lycurgus*, p. 843e.

<sup>7</sup> Paus. II, 17, 3; cf. Thuc. II, 2. The chronology of Lindos, Rhodes, was similarly based on the annual priesthood of Athena. A long list of the eponymous priests was found there with the so-called "Temple Chronicle." It has not yet been published. Blinkenberg, *Die lindische Tempelchronik* ("Kleine Texte," ed. Lietzmann) p. 4, note to line 1.

the priestesses, if not their statues, apparently extended well back into the pre-Dorian age of Greece. Dionysius of Halicarnassus,<sup>1</sup> for example, cites an event as happening in the third generation before the Trojan War, and dates it by the chronology of the Argive priestesses. It would appear from this, that on the Heraeum rolls or tablets not only the names of the priestesses, but also some brief chronicle of the history of the land and probably the generations of the Argive kings were recorded. Is there any reason to believe that such a record, if it had come down to us, would be fundamentally less trustworthy than one from Egypt or Mesopotamia?

Although no very early examples of ancient Greek chronicles have survived,<sup>2</sup> yet, thanks to the Greek love of history and antiquarianism, we have at second and third hand recom compilations which must reflect very respectable primary sources. Thus fragments, quoted by later authors, exist of a history of the priestesses of the Argive Heraeum written by Hellanicus<sup>3</sup> in the last half of the fifth century B.C.; we can hardly doubt that this was based on ancient temple records. Similarly, at Athens, somewhat earlier in the same century, Pherecydes of Leros<sup>4</sup> composed a long work on Greek myth and legend; and still earlier, about 500 B.C., Acusilaus<sup>5</sup> occupied himself with the genealogies of Boeotia. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus Siculus, Stephanus of Byzantium, and such late historians are full of references to the fourth and fifth century antiquarians of the Greek mainland, whose published writings carried throughout the Hellenistic world whatever information the local priestly chronicles contained — doubt-

<sup>1</sup> *Arch.*, I, 22.

<sup>2</sup> The Parian Marble (see below, p. 78) and the chronicle of the temple of Athena at Lindos, Rhodes (Blinkenberg, *op. cit.*), date from the third and first centuries B.C. The latter is not properly a chronicle, but primarily a list of treasures — mythical and real — given to the temple.

<sup>3</sup> αἱ Ἱερεῖαι ἐν Ἀργεῖ, in three books, fragments in Müller, *Fr. Hist. Graec.*, vol. I, pp. 51 ff. Cf. Dion. Hal. *Arch.* I, 72. The old temple of Hera was burned in 423 B.C.; Hellanicus's chronicle may have been composed before the fire, but it is quite possible that he composed it especially to replace old records which had been destroyed by the flames. In that case it would be based on fragments that had escaped, and on records memorized by the priestesses.

<sup>4</sup> Müller, *Fr. Hist. Graec.*, vol. I, pp. 70 ff.; cf. W. Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur* (6th ed.), vol. I, pp. 454 f.

<sup>5</sup> Müller, *Fr. Hist. Graec.*, vol. I, pp. 101 ff.

less with added commentaries and editorial corruptions. Pausanias not only was familiar with the ancient historiographers of his day, but, we may be sure, consulted temple records and priestly traditions wherever he could find them. At the last remove these chronicles and their expoundings were dramatized into innumerable popular tales, much more widely known and generally believed, of course, than the basic historic documents.

Sir J. G. Frazer<sup>1</sup> has said astutely that "myth has its source in reason, legend in memory, and folk-tale in imagination." The first and the last of these, therefore, are of little use as direct historical evidence; but legend, when disentangled from its invariable accompaniment of myth and folk-lore, and checked by archaeological evidence, is fundamentally historical, and deserves the most respectful consideration.

In general, it is safe to say that cosmologies, myths of the creation and the flood, stories where the hand of the etiologist appears, are of little or no historical value. The value of hero tales varies inversely with their romantic content, since these may start with a historic foundation, but if constantly worked over by bards and dramatists or often pictorially expressed, may become greatly elaborated and greatly deformed. Thus, I should consider the labors of Heracles as almost wholly without historical value; the *Odyssey* and the voyage of the Argo as having relatively little, though there is obviously a background of geographic truth at least; tales of warfare, such as the *Seven against Thebes* and the *Iliad*, I should consider to have a good historical basis and the names of the heroes involved to be in general those of veritable persons — though the details which make the most popular stories are, in all probability, artistic embellishments. In contrast, genealogies, lists of kings and priests, dry documents of the past ill suited for epic verse, seem of the essence of those hieratic chronicles whose existence we must assume; and therefore, in a sense, these may be rated as written history.

In the last century, the romantic school of classical scholars based its studies of Greek pre-history largely on the classic dramatists and story-tellers, and myth and folk-tale were often accepted with little criticisms. In the reaction of the more modern scientific school, there

<sup>1</sup> Preface to Apollodorus (Loeb Library), vol. I, p. xxxi.



is often a tendency to discard, equally uncritically, all traditional history of the heroic age. Thus, the problem of the "Achaeans" and the "Pelasgians," once a major battle-field for antiquarians, has become a no-man's land, and many archaeologists tread lightly and breathe soft when near the debatable ground. For the ancient legends of the earliest Greeks are so embroidered with obvious fantasy that often it seems safest not to try to analyze, but to condemn or to ignore them all.

And yet this particular problem is one well suited to scientific analysis. The elements are three: the Pelasgians,<sup>1</sup> repeatedly stated by Greek authorities to have been the primitive inhabitants of Greece; the Achaeans, who seem to have been the rulers of Greece at the time of the Trojan War, as depicted in the Homeric poems; the Dorians, who swept over the country from the north a century later, as admitted without question by all ancient historians and by most modern ones. The problem is — were these three distinct and separate races, and if so, whence and when did the Achaeans come to Greece? The Greeks themselves admitted the problem; the evidence of modern archaeology, instead of solving it, seems only to have given rise to a greater conflict of theories.

Ridgeway<sup>2</sup> has pointed out that the culture indicated by Schliemann's finds in the shaft graves at Mycenae does not agree with that pictured in the Homeric poems, and that the new elements of the latter — body-armor, greaves, helmet, round shields, cutting swords, chitons, brooches, the use of iron, and instances of fair hair — all point to a northern race.<sup>3</sup> Therefore he argues that the shaft grave kings (Late Helladic I) were Pelasgians, and that there was an invasion of Achaeans from the north shortly before the Trojan War, followed by another northern invasion, of Dorians this time, shortly after the war.

Sir Arthur Evans<sup>4</sup> maintains that there was an invasion and wide-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Myres, *A History of the Pelasgian Theory*, in *J. H. S.*, XXVII (1907), pp. 170 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Early Age of Greece*, *passim*.

<sup>3</sup> For the most recent discussion of northern influences in the art of the shaft graves, see Karo, *Ath. Mitt.*, XL (1915, pub. 1925), pp. 113-230.

<sup>4</sup> *J. H. S.*, XLV (1925), pp. 45-46, note 4; *Palace of Minos*, p. 23. Cf. Hall, *Aegean Archaeology*, p. 259; *Ancient History of Near East*, pp. 56 ff.

spread colonization of Greece from Crete in the Late Minoan period.<sup>1</sup> Apparently he does not believe in any further invasion before that of the Dorians. The Homeric disagreements seem to be disregarded by him, probably on the theory that the poems reflect the post-Dorian culture of the ninth-eighth century when they were written.

Wace and Blegen<sup>2</sup> have shown good reason to believe that there was an invasion of Greece from an uncertain source at the beginning of the Middle Helladic period, but reject the idea of any considerable colonization from Crete, or other invasion before the late twelfth century. Probably, like Evans, they consider the Homeric evidence unreliable, and like him, they discreetly refrain from discussing "Achaeans" or "Pelasgians."

Nilsson<sup>3</sup> believes in a triple invasion of Greeks from the north; Ionians who pushed on to Crete by the end of the Middle Minoan age; Achaeans who are responsible for the Mycenaean civilization of L. H. II and L. H. III; and last the Dorians. He also admits the possibility of Cretan colonization of the mainland in Late Helladic times.

Beloch<sup>4</sup> maintains that the first Greeks descended into the peninsula as early as the beginning of the Middle Helladic period, and that a second northern invasion occurred before the end of that period. This second invasion is to him a prolonged Achaean-Dorian migration: he considers the tradition of a later distinctly Dorian conquest to be purely fabulous.

Harland,<sup>5</sup> in a concise survey of the recent archaeological evidence, agrees with Wace and Blegen as to the Middle Helladic invasion, and with Beloch as to a single gradual Achaean-Dorian migration from the north. But this he places at the end of L. H. II, and prolongs it from about 1400 to 1100 B.C., ending with a violent raid of no profound effect, which he considers the basis for the tradition of a Dorian conquest. He ignores the Pelasgians completely.

<sup>1</sup> Equivalent to Late Helladic in the chronology of the mainland. For comparative chronologies, see Blegen, *Korakou*, pp. 120 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Blegen, *Korakou*, p. 125.

<sup>3</sup> *Minoan-Myc. Religion*, pp. 32-43.

<sup>4</sup> *Griechische Geschichte*, I, *passim*.

<sup>5</sup> *The Peloponnesos in the Bronze Age*, in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XXXIV (1923), *passim*.

From the diversity of these theories it is obvious that the archaeological evidence is not conclusive, and that so far the actual remains have been reconciled with the Homeric picture only by discounting or ignoring to a greater or less degree either the one or the other. I think, however, that in Greek legend there is consistently stated a clear historical outline which fits the archaeological evidence and yet agrees with Homer.

Let us see first what we can deduce with reasonable certainty from the material remains.

It seems clear that at the beginning of the bronze age there was a fairly closely related culture, and perhaps a common race, throughout the Aegean, on the mainland of Greece, in the Cyclades and in Crete. In the Cyclades and Crete this culture developed normally and gradually, without any indication of foreign intrusion or conquest, and with only slight artistic influence from Egypt and the east, until the end of the Middle Minoan period at least.

On the other hand, the excavations on the mainland give clear evidence of a cultural break, attended by more or less violence, at the beginning of the Middle Helladic period. At this time many sites were burned and abandoned, new house plans appear, there is a change in tomb construction and an almost complete revolution in the form, decoration, and method of manufacture of the pottery.<sup>1</sup> The characteristic new pottery is the well known "Minyan" ware, of fine, smooth, gray, wheel-made fabric, and quite distinctive shapes. The sudden and widespread appearance of this ware is practical proof of a foreign invasion which covered the major part of Greece. The source of this invasion is not so clear. It certainly did not come from Crete, for Minyan ware is practically unknown there. It is exceedingly unlikely that it came from Thessaly or from the Cyclades,<sup>2</sup> for Minyan ware is not very common in either place, and where it

<sup>1</sup> *The Peloponnesos in the Bronze Age*, in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XXXIV (1923), pp. 12 ff. The excavations at Eutresis in Boeotia reveal the same general destruction by fire at the beginning of the Middle Helladic period. (H. Goldman, *Excavations at Eutresis*, in *Notes of Fogg Art Museum*, Harvard University, Sept., 1927, pp. 36, 37.)

<sup>2</sup> Wace and Thompson, *Prehistoric Thessaly*, pp. 186, 247; Blegen, *Korakou*, p. 15. Minyan Ware was imported in considerable quantity into Melos, *B. S. A.*, XVII (1910-1911), pp. 16 ff.



does occur is probably imported from Greece proper. Fosdyke<sup>1</sup> has pointed out a type of ware from Troy which he calls proto-Minyan, but as Childe<sup>2</sup> shows, the Greek ware is not a derivative of this, and if there be any relationship at all, it is probably one of collateral descent from a common unknown ancestor. It is also inherently improbable that at so early a date (1900 B.C.?) there could be a nautical migration across the Aegean on a sufficient scale to revolutionize the civilization of Greece.

Since all other sources seem to be eliminated, I suggest that the invasion which brought the Minyan ware into Phocis and Boeotia — where it shows its earliest and most characteristic forms<sup>3</sup> — followed a traffic way from the northwest, where so far prehistoric excavations are lacking. Herodotus<sup>4</sup> says that in prehistoric times objects were brought from the Hyperboreans westward through Scythia to the Adriatic, thence south into Greece by Dodona, and by the Maliac gulf to Euboea. This is evidently a very old trade route, probably that by which amber was brought from the Baltic, and perhaps also that by which tin came from the mines of Saxony and Bohemia, to form with the copper of Cyprus the bronze of the Mediterranean world.

If this hypothesis be correct, the Middle Helladic immigrants would presumably be an Indo-European folk, speaking some sort of Greek; their predecessors, to judge by the later development of the race in Crete, were probably of a different ethnic and linguistic stock.<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately this migration took place so long before the classical period, — a thousand years and more, — that we could hardly expect to find traces of it in Greek traditional history.

At the end of the bronze age (c. 1100 B.C.) there was a second great migration from the north. The evidence for this — destruction on city sites, introduction of iron weapons, change in pottery forms, general degeneration of the arts, and so forth — is so abundant and ac-

<sup>1</sup> Fosdyke, *The Pottery called Minyan Ware*, in *J. H. S.*, XXXIV (1914), pp. 126 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Childe, *On the Date and Origin of Minyan Ware*, in *J. H. S.*, XXXV (1915), pp. 196 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Childe, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

<sup>4</sup> IV, 33.

<sup>5</sup> See the striking evidence furnished by place-names (Haley and Blegen, *The Coming of the Greeks*, in *A.J.A.*, XXXII (1928), pp. 141-154).

cords so well with the classical traditions of the Dorian invasion, that, with the exception of Beloch, almost all archaeologists and historians admit a substantial historical basis for these traditions.

Between these two waves of northern *Volkswanderung* the culture of the Greek mainland seems to have developed without any marked break or sudden general change at any point. Commerce with the islands was essential for the importation of the all-important Cyprian copper. By the end of the Middle Helladic period cups and inlaid weapons from the workshops of Cretan smiths are found among the treasures of the Greek chieftains, and occasional imported pieces had exerted an influence on the decoration of the native earthen-ware.<sup>1</sup> But at the same time the great bulk of the pottery continued a normal development of mainland types. There were local metal workers, too, who no doubt emulated, though they could by no means equal, the craftsmanship of the Cretans. The gold masks from the shaft graves at Mycenae show the lack of skill of the royal jewelers, and at the same time indicate that the ruling race was of a full-bearded, non-Cretan type.<sup>2</sup>

In the Late Helladic period the amount of importation continues to grow, but no sudden increase is perceptible. At the same time the native pottery develops consistently, the decoration passing from naturalistic to formal, and then to a dry but elegant conventionalism which is usually considered degenerate; then, without any very great break save in the variety of vase shapes, the geometric ware appears. The fabric itself shows no deterioration whatsoever.<sup>3</sup>

At some time in L. H. III, probably toward the end of the period, an interest in the representation of figures appears; but as only three or four fragments of pottery decorated with human figures have so far been found on the mainland,<sup>4</sup> prior to the geometric ware, we can hardly consider this to mark a cultural break.

Besides the pottery, there is a continuous increase in Cretan importations till the latter part of the Late Helladic period. Seal stones

<sup>1</sup> Blegen, *Korakou*, p. 115; cf. *B. S. A.*, XXII (1916-18), p. 189.

<sup>2</sup> Schuckhardt, *Schliemann's Excavations*, figs. 223, 224, 254, 255.

<sup>3</sup> Blegen, *op. cit.*, pp. 59, 61.

<sup>4</sup> Furtwängler-Loeschke, *Mykenische Vasen*, pls. 42, 43; Schliemann, *Tiryns*, pl. 14; Rodenwaldt, *Fries des Megarons von Mykenai*, fig. 14.

and gold and silver work become abundant.<sup>1</sup> It is quite possible that some of this work is from the hands of Cretan artists working in Greece — there is no way of deciding the question; but there can be little doubt that the frescoes of Mycenae and Tiryns,<sup>2</sup> probably the sculptures over the Lion Gate and on the façades of the great tholos tombs, and possibly much of the architecture of the palaces, — though these are distinctly non-Cretan in plan, — were produced by immigrant artisans.

Three items only, of the material remains of Late Helladic culture, appear so suddenly, so widely, and so fully developed as to indicate the abrupt intrusion of some new element into Mycenaean society. But two of these appear at periods a hundred years apart, and no specific foreign provenance has been conclusively demonstrated for either. The first is the tholos tomb, which succeeds, without overlapping in time, the shaft graves at Mycenae.<sup>3</sup> The shaft grave is a royal form of burial which developed quite naturally from the normal cist grave of the Middle Helladic period. The chamber tomb, of which the tholos seems to be in turn a royal form, is found in the lower Argolid,<sup>4</sup> contemporary with the shaft graves of Mycenae. But there is no apparent development of one type from the other, and the "royal" tomb of the second type is not found at Mycenae until after the last of the "royal" tombs of the first. Here we have good evidence of a conquest; a native dynasty replaced by one with foreign burial customs, which had perhaps penetrated the lower Argolid some time before Mycenae fell into its power. The widespread occurrence of the tholos tomb indicates that during L. H. III the conquest covered the major part of Greece, but the fact that its appearance is not marked by any radical changes in the forms of pottery, or accompanied by any signs of devastation, is proof that the invasion was that of a military aristocracy rather than a mass migration. Probably the new rulers came in small scattered bands, like the Normans in Calabria and Sicily, their chief interest being to possess and enjoy the

<sup>1</sup> Evans, *Palace of Minos*, p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Rodenwaldt, *Fries des Megarons von Mykenai*, p. 47; Rodenwaldt, *Tiryns*, II, p. 202.

<sup>3</sup> Wace, *Excavations at Mycenae*, in *B. S. A.*, XXV (1921-23), p. 120.

<sup>4</sup> According to the recent discoveries of Dr. Blegen, not yet published. Cf. news-letter in *A. J. A.*, XXXI (1927), p. 390.



fruits of the country as they found them, rather than to ravage and pass on. The tholos tombs appear at Mycenae shortly before the end of L. H. I, that is, toward the end of the sixteenth century, and continue uninterruptedly to the end of the Late Helladic period.<sup>1</sup> It is possible that at other sites they may appear slightly earlier, but nowhere are they so numerous as at Mycenae. Here seems to have been the greatest city, if not the longest rule of the conquerors.

No built tombs resembling the tholoi in form and structure have been found at any earlier date outside of Greece. Excavated chamber tombs, quite like the non-royal counterparts of the tholoi on the mainland, and some vaulted structures which suggest the tholoi of the mainland, have been found in Crete, but none of these appears to be older than L. M. II. Wace suggests<sup>2</sup> that some clue to the origin of the tholos tomb may eventually be found in western Asia Minor, but "for the present we have no information to guide us to the home of the tholos tomb."

The second novelty is the walled city. So far as I am aware, no mainland site of the Middle Helladic period shows any sign of fortification; yet in Late Helladic times Tiryns and Mycenae were ringed with walls so massive as to seem to later Greeks the work of superhuman hands. Just when this art made its appearance cannot yet be said. The walls of Mycenae, including the famous Lion Gate, are assigned by Wace<sup>3</sup> to L. H. III. The fortifications of Tiryns seem for the most part contemporary, though some portions are perhaps earlier, L. H. I or L. H. II.<sup>4</sup> The great walls of Gla<sup>5</sup> are surely L. H. III, and so probably are the "Cyclopean" fortifications of the Acropolis of Athens.<sup>6</sup> "It was in the Late Helladic period that Eutresis was for the first time fortified with a heavy Cyclopean wall," says Miss Goldman.<sup>7</sup> It is possible, of course, that the art of fortification developed gradually on Greek soil for two or three centuries before the great Argolic citadels of the end of the fifteenth century; but the

<sup>1</sup> Wace, *Excavations at Mycenae* in *B. S. A.*, XXV (1921-23), p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *B. S. A.*, XXV (1921-23), pp. 394-395.

<sup>3</sup> *B. S. A.*, XXV (1921-23), pp. 12-13. <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *B. C. H.*, XVIII (1894), pp. 271 ff.

<sup>6</sup> *A. J. A.*, XXVIII (1924), p. 157.

<sup>7</sup> *Excavations at Eutresis*, in *Notes of Fogg Art Museum*, Harvard University, Sept., 1927, p. 83.

absence of any such work which can be surely dated before L. H. I, and the skillful planning and complete assurance in construction of the walls of L. H. III, point rather to the introduction, somewhere in the interval, of builders from lands where fortress walls and citadels were habitual. Prehistoric Crete is notoriously innocent of military architecture; on the other hand, the second city of Phylakopi shows extensive double city walls of the first half of the second millennium,<sup>1</sup> while in all probability the first city of Troy, and certainly the second,<sup>2</sup> was already strongly fortified in the third millennium B.C. Within the last few years Wolters and Welter-Mauve,<sup>3</sup> excavating the prehistoric site about the temple of Aphrodite on the Island of Aegina, have found a settlement which appears to have been fortified before the Middle Helladic period. We must, however, await fuller publication before relying strongly on this evidence. In general it appears that the art of fortification is oldest to the east of the Aegean in Asia Minor, that it developed later in the Cyclades and reached the mainland of Greece about L. H. I-II; but that it did not come by way of Crete.

The third item which may indicate a break in Greek cultural development is the sudden appearance, at about the beginning of L. H. III (c. 1400), of small terra-cotta figurines of a female deity.<sup>4</sup> In some examples, — probably an early type, — the goddess holds a child in her arms. The standard types, with arms upraised or down at the sides, are common at all L. H. III sites. There are gradual changes throughout the period, and with the coming of geometric ware the figurines seem at most sites to disappear. There can be little doubt, however, that they are the ancestors of somewhat different figurines

<sup>1</sup> Mackenzie's dating of the second town, 2500 B.C. (*Excavations at Phylakopi*, p. 261), is certainly too early; Wace (*Camb. Anc. Hist.*, I, p. 602) places it in the Middle Cycladic period.

<sup>2</sup> Dörpfeld, *Troja und Ilion*, I, pp. 44-45, 49-80.

<sup>3</sup> *Gnomon*, II (1926), pp. 120 ff.; cf. *J. H. S.*, XLVI (1926), p. 241.

<sup>4</sup> Harland, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XXXIV (1923), p. 32; cf. examples from Mycenae (Wace, *B. S. A.*, XXV (1921-23), Index, s. v. Terracotta figurines, Human), and especially the collection from the sanctuary of Athena Pronaia at Delphi (Demangel, *Fouilles de Delphes*, Vol. II, fasc. 5, pp. 14-20). The various types have been somewhat distinguished by Tsountas, *Eph. Arch.*, 1888, pp. 168 ff.; cf. Nilsson, *Minoan-Myc. Religion*, pp. 261-263.

of the archaic period, such as those from the Heraeum, Tegea, or Boeotia. The first of these little idols probably accompanied the introduction of a new cult to Greece, but they do not imply a new race of rulers as certainly as does the change in burial customs. At any rate, their appearance does not mark any general break in Late Helladic culture. Where the type originated is as yet a mystery; the goddess is probably related to the "Snake Goddess" of Crete or the "Great Mother" of Anatolia, but the form of the idol seems to be peculiar to Greece. In Crete, only one early example which approaches it at all closely has been found,<sup>1</sup> and that is not of terra cotta but of lead.

But if the new elements in Late Helladic culture, which we have noticed so far, point to a growth of Aegean influence, there are others which seem to point to influence from the north. The crudely carved stelae from above the shaft graves of Mycenae<sup>2</sup> show clearly that the warriors of L. H. I were armed in the Cretan manner, not only with the long stiff Cretan thrusting swords, such as were found in the graves, but also with the great figure 8 Cretan shields. The persistence of this form of shield in Arcadia, and of a derived form in Boeotia in classical times, proves that it was once general in Greece, and that in places it was never supplanted. But in L. H. III one of the grave stelae was repainted, and shows, as do paintings on vases of the same period,<sup>3</sup> that at that time a small round shield was used. Spears instead of swords are carried, and so far, remains of swords from L. H. III are rare. The late warriors wear short fringed tunics, greaves or leggings, head-gear of various styles, and perhaps corselets; they are bearded and no hair shows below their helmets. All these features are markedly non-Cretan, and are, in their general type, northern. The characteristic male costume for Crete, from the Middle Minoan period down, consisted of a loin cloth or short kilt;<sup>4</sup> the costumes on the L. H. I grave stelae seem less rather than more elaborate, but in the L. H. III frescoes of Tiryns and Mycenae<sup>5</sup> the men all

<sup>1</sup> *Archaeologia*, XV (1914), pp. 74-75, fig. 84.

<sup>2</sup> *B. S. A.*, XXV (1921-23), pls. XIX, XX.

<sup>3</sup> Furtwängler-Loeschke, *op. cit.*, pls. 42, 43; Schliemann, *Tiryns*, pl. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Rodenwaldt, *Tiryns*, II, p. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Wace, *op. cit.*, pl. XXVII; Rodenwaldt, *op. cit.*, pl. 115.



wear sleeved tunics. It is true that similar tunics are shown on a sarcophagus from Hagia Triada,<sup>1</sup> but the scenes there show so many foreign elements that it is questionable evidence for the normal Cretan costume. A small archaic bronze figurine from Crete<sup>2</sup> indicates that the loin cloth persisted there down to classic times. Some time in L. H. III the fibula, a distinctly northern object, appears in Greece, but it is so rare and so late that it is not very compelling evidence.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, iron is found in small quantities,<sup>4</sup> used for ornament only, but since tradition dated the discovery of iron in Crete from the time of Minos, its use is no proof of northern influence.

From this mass of apparently conflicting archaeological evidence, so much, I think, and no more can be definitely posited: — that from the latter part of L. H. I a considerable part of Greece was ruled by bands of foreign conquerors who are responsible for the tholos tombs; that the importation of Cretan wares and immigration of foreign artisans continued to increase; that new elements of armament and costume, northern in appearance, were introduced, so that by L. H. III the culture of the Argolid, and in fact the whole Aegean, was quite different from that of Crete in L. M. I, and quite similar to that described in the Homeric poems; but that all the while the native culture continued an uninterrupted progressive development, thus proving that the conquest was not a matter of mass migration, but rather of raids by professional warriors, who probably descended on Greece at many points, and therefore probably came by sea. The mention of occasional fair hair among the Homeric warriors would argue these warriors to be of northern stock, if it were not quite possible that fair-haired strains might have persisted in Greece from the presumably northern migration that introduces M. H. I.

Now, if we turn to legendary history for an explanation of this archaeological picture, we find no Greek tradition of any conquest from the north before the Dorian invasion, nor any tradition of an invasion from Crete at any time. The inhabitants of Greece at the time of the Trojan War are generally called Achaeans, and Herodotus,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Candia Museum; *Mon. Ant.*, XIX (1908), pl. II.

<sup>2</sup> *Alt. Mus.*, Berlin; Bossart, *Alt Kreta*, pl. 155.

<sup>3</sup> Ridgeway, *op. cit.*, p. 261; Schuckhardt, *Schliemann's Excavations*, p. 296.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> VIII, 73.

undoubtedly acquainted with the best sixth and fifth century traditions, says that, though the inhabitants of the particular district known in classical times as Achaea had moved there from another section, yet they, like the Arcadians and Cynurians, had always been inhabitants of the Peloponnesus. On the other hand, Herodotus and others say that the original inhabitants of the Peloponnesus were the Pelasgians,<sup>1</sup> their eponymous ancestor Pelasgus being the first man in Arcadia;<sup>2</sup> while the eponymous ancestor of the Achaeans,<sup>3</sup> the great-grandson of Deucalion, was a man of relatively late birth and of northern forebears.

But the heroes camped before Troy are not called Achaeans only in the *Iliad* — they are frequently collectively called Argives, and still more often, Danaans.<sup>4</sup> The name "Argives" requires little explanation; the leader of the host and the greatest contingent of the warriors came from the lands about Argos, hence the geographic name, which strictly applied only to the residents of a limited district, was extended to include the inhabitants of all Greece. The names Achaioi and Danaoi seem to be used with no distinction at all between them. But there is one point which has escaped general notice: whereas *Achaioi* is paralleled by *Achaiis*,<sup>5</sup> the name of the land in which the Achaeans dwelt, there appears to have been no geographic name corresponding to *Danaoi*. The *Argeioi* presumably got their name from their land, which in turn was named for its principal city; *Danaoi* was evidently a racial or tribal name.<sup>6</sup> As for the *Achaioi*, if

<sup>1</sup> I, 56; cf. Myres, *History of the Pelasgian Theory*, *J. H. S.*, XXVIII (1907), pp. 170 ff.; Paus., VIII, 1, 4; Thucydides (I, 2) says that the Arcadians were aborigines.

<sup>2</sup> Hesiod, *Catalogue of Women*, 30.

<sup>3</sup> Achaeus, son of Zuthus, Apoll., *Bibl.* I, 7, 3. He was given a various parentage by other late authors, but he is never "earth-born."

<sup>4</sup> A. Della Seta, *Achaioi, Argeioi, Danaoi*, in *Rendiconti dei Lincei* 1907, pp. 133-211, maintains that the three names are used in the Homeric poems solely for their various metrical values, without the slightest difference in significance.

<sup>5</sup> *Iliad*, I, 254; III, 75, 258; VII, 124; XI, 770; *Odyssey*, XI, 166, 481; XIII, 249; XXI, 107; XXIII, 68.

<sup>6</sup> Pausanias (VII, 1, 7) says that both Argives and Lacedæmonians were called Achaeans, but that the name Danaoi was peculiar to the Argives. E. Smith, *Symbolae Arctoe* (now *Symbolae Osloensis*) Pt. I, 1922, p. 80, points out that all the Greeks at Troy were called Argeioi, because they were serving under Agamem-

they were named for their land, we should expect the land in turn to be named for some city;<sup>1</sup> but no city named anything like *Achaie* is known; wherefore it seems probable that the land got its name from the inhabitants, and that *Achaioi*, like *Danaoi*, is a racial or tribal name. But it is quite unnatural to use two distinct tribal names for exactly the same people, and therefore we must conclude that at the time of the Trojan War the *Danaoi* were the dominant folk in Greece, and that *Achaioi*, though originally a tribal name, had come to have a geographical significance, like *Argeioi* — only, of course, of wider extension, since *Achaiis* included virtually all Greece, while *Argos* was the capital district only. The situation would be somewhat parallel to that of England after the Norman Conquest, when the rulers might call themselves *Normans* from their immediate race, or *English* from their actual domain, without the latter name implying kinship to the Angles, whose earlier conquest had named the land.

Collating these literary traditions with the archaeological evidence at Mycenae, we should naturally equate the rulers of the fifteenth to the twelfth centuries, the tholos-tomb kings, with the *Danaoi*; the earlier shaft-grave dynasty would then be *Achaioi*, whose tribal ancestors first occupied the land at the beginning of the Middle Helladic period, "long before human memory" to classical Greeks;<sup>2</sup> and the

non, ruler of Argos; and he draws from the expression *Ἀργείων Δαναῶν* (Θ 578) the suggestion that Danaoi may be the racial name while Argeioi is the geographical name of the inhabitants of Argos. Cf. *Κεφαλλήνες* and *Ἰθακήσιοι*.

<sup>1</sup> As *Θηβαῖς* is named for the city *Θῆβαι* or *Θήβη*.

<sup>2</sup> Castor of Rhodes, quoted by Eusebius, [*Chron.*, I, pp. 25 ff., trans. by Jerome (Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, 27)] gives a chronology of the kings of Sicyon, which he claims as the oldest known line in Greece. According to him, it began 959 years before the coming of the Heracleidae. From the first king, Aegialeus, to the thirteenth, in whose reign Cecrops is said to have appeared, is an even 500 years; 50 years more brings us to the fifteenth king, contemporary with Danaus. The figures rouse suspicion, but the period of the first king agrees so well with the archaeological evidence for the date of the Middle Helladic invasion, that it suggests that Sicyon may have had real, though vague, traditions of unbroken civilization from that early time.

It is not at first apparent why the chronology of the Sicyonian kings should have been preserved with those of Argos and Athens, for the importance of Sicyon in classical times was relatively slight and her early kings played little part in the popular tales of Greece. Eusebius undoubtedly follows Castor closely, and since he is making a compendium of chronologies, we may assume that Castor gave only these



still earlier inhabitants, the Aegean people of Early Helladic days, might be the Pelasgians whose scattered remnants still persisted in historic times. This would bring Herodotus' statement<sup>1</sup> that the different groups of Pelasgians spoke a common language, quite distinct from Greek, into accord with the prevalent opinion that the prehistoric Cretans, of primitive Aegean stock, spoke a non-Indo-European tongue. The Greek name *Pelasgoi*<sup>2</sup> might have been given the older people by the conquering *Achaioi*, either as a meaningless imitation of their unintelligible non-Greek name, or perhaps as signifying "sea

three genealogies for the mainland. The fact that that of Sicyon was the oldest known may have been somewhat responsible for its inclusion, but it is more likely that Castor himself took the three in a body from some still earlier mainland source. Neither he nor Eusebius can have reviewed them critically, for the chronologies of the three lines do not quite agree, nor is the sum of reigns in any line equal to the total stated for that line. Castor's source could certainly not have been Athenian, since the Athenian kings come last; by the same reasoning, it was more likely Sicyonian than Argive.

The last king of Sicyon comes two long generations — 82 years — after the fall of Troy: This date corresponds to the traditional date of the Dorian invasion. Immediately after the kings come six names introduced by the phrase "*exin iam non reges, sed Carneii Sacerdotes.*" The cult of Carneian Apollo was traditionally founded by the Heracleidae. Apparently the Dorians established Apollo's priests as rulers of Sicyon. But only for a short time; for the sixth — who fled, says Castor, on account of financial difficulties — ends the line. Carneian worship did not cease however, nor the priesthood die. Pausanias (II, 11, 2) saw a ruined temple of Carneios at Sicyon, with walls and roof gone, but columns still standing. Apparently it had been peripteral, hence a building of some importance in classical times. The cult, though removed, was still continued; with a shrine, forbidden to all save the Carneian priests, in the sanctuary of Asclepios (Paus., II, 10, 2). Asclepius must have outbid his older brother for popular favor in Hellenistic times.

It may be inferred from all this, that Castor's ultimate source was a temple chronicle kept by the Sicyonian priests of Carneios: such a source should be historically reliable, at least as far back as the Dorian invasion.

<sup>1</sup> I, 57. Cf. Asiatic affinities of E. H. and E. M. place-names. (Haley and Blegen, *A.J.A.*, XXXII (1928), pp. 141-154.)

<sup>2</sup> The Greeks seem to have been in considerable doubt as to the proper spelling of this word. The favorite etymology considered it to mean "stork-people," wanderers, from *Pelargoi*, storks. (Philoch. *ad Serv. Aen.*, VIII, 600; Strabo, V, 313.) May not all the variant forms be false etymologies to explain a pre-Greek name pronounced something like *Pelages*? And may not the name *Leleges* be from an allied pre-Greek word?

folk,"<sup>1</sup> a reasonable epithet, in the eyes of land immigrants, for those of the island race. In late classical times the name was used quite vaguely, as merely signifying primeval.

Now, though classical tradition is definitely counter to the theory of any invasion of *Achaioi*, it just as definitely proclaims the coming of the *Danaoi*. Danaus, obviously an eponymous hero representing the tribe of the *Danaoi*, is consistently stated to have arrived in a penteconter in the Argolic gulf.<sup>2</sup> Pausanias<sup>3</sup> says that he promptly overcame the local king Gelanor and established a dynasty. This implies more of a following than fifty daughters, however ready with the knife. Two generations later the kingdom was divided into an eastern half, comprising the Heraeum, Midea, and Tiryns, and a western half dominated by Argos. Proetus, though called a brother of the Argive king, actually establishes himself as king of the eastern half, by the help of a band of warriors with whom he comes from Lycia; and being established, his Lycians build the fortress of Tiryns for him.<sup>4</sup> The king of Argos is then killed by Perseus, who, though he comes from foreign lands, is said, in a highly romantic story, to be the grandson of his victim.<sup>5</sup> Perseus exchanges kingdoms with the son of Proetus, and moving northward, builds a strongly fortified citadel at Mycenae. This also is the work of the Lycian Cyclops. Contempo-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Herod., VII, 94. "Aegialean Pelasgoi" — "Pelasgians of the seashore." Giles and Bury, *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, II, pp. 8 and 476, seem to approve the derivation from πέλαγος.

<sup>2</sup> The Parian Marble (ep. 9, ll. 14-15) says: ἀφ' οὗ ναῦς κατασκευασθεῖσα ὑπὸ Δαναοῦ πρώτη πεντ[ήκοντα κωπ]ῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου [εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐπλευσε καὶ ὠνομάσθη πεντηκόντορος, καὶ αἱ Δαναοῦ θυγατέρες . . . The ultimate source from which this particular item of the third century B.C. Attic inscription was derived may very well be a chronology of the Argive priestesses, committed to writing as early as writing was known in Greece. If the late copy has preserved the phraseology of the original, may it not be that in some early transcription a Π mistaken for a P gave rise to the preposterous — but picturesque and therefore popular — story that Danaus had arrived in a ship with "ΠΕΝΤΕΚΟΝΤΑ ΚΟΠΟΝ"? Given the fifty daughters of Danaus, the real followers of the viking would naturally become the enamored fifty sons of Ægyptus.

<sup>3</sup> II, 16, 1; II, 19, 3 ff.; cf. Apoll. *Bibl.*, II, 1, 4.

<sup>4</sup> Bacchylides, *Epinic.*, X, 77 ff.; Paus., II, 16, 5; II, 25, 8; Apoll. *Bibl.*, II, 2, 1; Strabo, VIII, 6, 8, p. 371.

<sup>5</sup> Paus., II, 16, 2; Apoll. *Bibl.*, II, 4, 1-4; see Frazer's commentary on the Perseus legend in Apoll. (Loeb Library), I, p. 153, note 3.

rary with Perseus, another foreigner, Pelops, comes to Greece.<sup>1</sup> He himself is concerned with Elis rather than with the Argolid, but his son, Atreus, succeeds the son of Perseus as lord of Mycenae. Atreus' son is leader of the Greeks before Troy, and with his great-grandson the line is finally overwhelmed by the Dorian invasion.<sup>2</sup> All this sounds like reasonably reliable historical tradition.

As for the kingdom of Argos, this was divided, after the rule of Anaxagoras, the great-grandson of Proetus, into three parts. In one part, four kings in four generations reached to the Trojan War. In the second part, the same period saw six kings in five generations, and in the third, seven kings in seven generations.<sup>3</sup> This last line, as was evident to Pausanias, must have been extraordinarily short-lived, while the generations of the first were long. To sum up, if Lynceus, the first named king of the Danaans, be taken as the first generation, then Proetus is the third, Perseus the fourth, and the various contemporary kings of the time of the Trojan War were respectively the sixth, the tenth, the eleventh, and the thirteenth.

The date of the Trojan War, as fixed by tradition and archaeology, is approximately 1200 B.C. and the Dorian invasion is similarly set from eighty years to a century later.<sup>4</sup> The genealogies give three generations (approximately thirty years apiece) for this interval, which is entirely reasonable. Taking the shortest Argive line as an average for the later kings, — the Mycenaean line is one generation shorter

<sup>1</sup> The earliest account of the legend of Pelops is in Pindar, *Olymp.*, I, 67 (109) ff.; the fullest is given by Apoll. *Epit.*, II, 3 ff.; for others, see Frazer's commentary, Apoll. (Loeb Library), II, p. 157, note 4 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Paus., II, 18, 6 ff., VII, 1, 7 ff.; Apoll. *Bibl.*, II, 8, 3.

<sup>3</sup> Paus., II, 18, 4 ff.; cf. Schol. on Pindar, *Nem.*, IX, 30; Eustathius on Homer, *Iliad*, II, 566.

<sup>4</sup> Jacoby, *Marmor Parium*, p. 146, gives calculations for various ancient datings of the fall of Troy, ranging from 1334 (Duris) to 1171 (Sosibios). The date given by Eratosthenes, 1184, seems to have had most authority in the ancient world. The dates assigned for the return of the Heracleidae range from 1154 (Timaios) to 1049 (Phainias). The chronologies of the kings of Sicyon, Argos, and Athens quoted by Eusebius (*Chron.*, I, 25 ff.) from Castor do not absolutely agree with one another, but collation gives an approximate agreement of 65 to 70 years from the commencement of Cecrops' reign to the coming of Danaus; 285 to 290 years from that date to the fall of Troy; and 80 to 87 years from the fall of Troy to the coming of the Heracleidae.



still, — we find that Lynceus comes ten generations, Proetus eight, and Perseus and Pelops seven generations before the Trojan War. With generations of thirty years, this brings Lynceus and the coming of the Danaans about 1500, Proetus about 1440, and Perseus and Pelops about 1410.<sup>1</sup> The Mycenaean line as a base of computation would bring these dates down thirty years, the longest Argive line would set them back a century.

The marble chronicle from Paros, compiled in Athens in the third century B.C., probably from older official Athenian documents, shows that the foregoing chronology was accepted by Greek historians, for it specifically states that the penteconter of Danaus arrived in the year 1510-1509 B.C.<sup>2</sup> Archaeology shows that the change from the "shaft-grave" to the "tholos-tomb" dynasty at Mycenae occurred about 1500 or a little earlier, and that the great fortification walls, with the Lion Gate and the existing court and megaron of the palace there, were all built about 1400.<sup>3</sup> Since these dates agree so perfectly with the traditional dates for the coming of the Danaans and the "founding" of Mycenae by Perseus,<sup>4</sup> is it not reasonable to accept the traditions as substantially historical?

Of course as the founder of a line, any historic Perseus was sure to be overlaid with myth. Though a Danaid, he was obviously not a son of the eponymous Danaus who had seized Argos three or four generations earlier; besides this, his father ought to be a god; so an eponymous Danaë was nominated as his mother. Again, since Greek pride always brought the ultimate ancestry of conquerors back to Greece, his mother was said to be an exiled daughter of the Argive king whose kingdom he more or less violently acquired. For the same reason probably, through the far wandering Io, the line of Danaus himself was brought back to an Argive origin; as similarly in Attica, Theseus was given a clandestine parentage which should make him rightful heir to the kingdom he conquered.

<sup>1</sup> Wace (*Camb. Anc. Hist.*, I, p. 178), by comparing traditional sources, arrives at the following dates: Cecrops between 1582 and 1556, Cadmus, 1513; Danaus, 1466; Pelops, 1283; Minos, 1229; Trojan War, 1192-1183.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. 9, ll. 14-15. See above, p. 61, note 2. For actual dating I follow Jacoby, *Marmor Parium*.

<sup>3</sup> *B. S. A.*, XXV (1921-23), pp. 245-246; cf. p. 13.

<sup>4</sup> Paus., II, 15, 4.

Greek tradition not only states definitely that the pre-Dorian invaders of the Argolid were Danaans and not Achaeans, but it goes further, and indicates clearly whence these invaders came. Danaus is uniformly said to have come from Egypt, some authorities adding that he stopped at Rhodes on the way.<sup>1</sup> Perseus also was from the east, coming by way of the island of Seriphos.<sup>2</sup> The hero-myths that grew up about his early life, before he reached Greece, said that he had rescued an Ethiopian princess from a sea monster, and had brought her along with him.<sup>3</sup> It may be that there is some connection between this princess and the snake goddess whose little images appear so abundantly just at the time of Perseus. Perhaps the cultivation of wheat was introduced by this second wave of Danaans, and with it came the cult of the eastern mother goddess. Joppa, on the coast of Palestine, is given by some authors as the point from which Perseus imported Andromeda.<sup>4</sup>

If we follow these traditions, the Danaans evidently neither were Cretans, nor did they come from the north. It has been suggested that when tradition gives Egypt as the place of origin, Crete is really meant, the two being in the same southeasterly direction from Greece;<sup>5</sup> but this substitution would require the very improbable voyage from Crete to Greece by way of Rhodes. It is true that a route from the mouth of the Nile by way of Rhodes is not much more direct. But it should not be forgotten that since Tothmes I, in the sixteenth century, had set his northern boundary stone on the Euphrates,<sup>6</sup> "Egypt," at the time of the Danaan invasion, included the whole of Syria and

<sup>1</sup> Herod., II, 182; Apoll. *Bibl.*, II, 1, 4; *Mar. Par.*, Ep. 9, l. 17. For bibliography of the Danaos legend see Frazer's commentary to Apoll. (Loeb Library), I, p. 137, note 2. The chronicle of the temple of Lindos does not mention Danaus.

<sup>2</sup> Apoll., *Bibl.*, II, 4, 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*; see Frazer's bibliography of the Andromeda legend in Apollodorus (Loeb Library), I, p. 158, note 3.

<sup>4</sup> Tzetzes, *Schol. on Lycophron*, 836; Conon, *Narrat.*, 40; cf. Josephus, *Bell. Iud.*, III, 9, 2.

<sup>5</sup> Wace, *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, I, p. 178. For Crete instead of Phoenicia as origin of Cadmeans, cf. Hall, *Aegean Arch.*, p. 259; *Anc. Hist. of Near East*, p. 60.

<sup>6</sup> Tothmes III, in his annals in the temple of Ammon at Karnak, states that he erected a boundary stone on the Euphrates, besides the tablet of his father (Tothmes I). Breasted, *Anc. Rec.*, II, p. 168.

Palestine. From any point on the coast line there, Rhodes would be a normal stepping-stone to Greece.

According to legendary history, the Danaans were not the only Late Helladic invaders of Greece, nor Argos the only focus of invasion, though, probably because of the unbroken traditions of the Heraeum, the Argive picture is more complete and doubtless more reliable than any other. The Parian Marble<sup>1</sup> states that eight years before the coming of Danaus, an expedition led by Cadmus had come to Thebes. General tradition<sup>2</sup> adds that Cadmus landed in Thrace and came south into Boeotia through Phocis, while an allied band settled on the island of Thasos. Cadmus is regularly called a Phoenician, but Pausanias<sup>3</sup> says that some think he came from Egypt, not Phoenicia. Of course, in the sixteenth century the great Semitic sea power later known as "the Phoenicians" did not yet exist; Phoenicia was simply one section of the Egyptian sea-coast.<sup>4</sup>

For the Athenian dynasty the Parian Marble<sup>5</sup> gives Cecrops as the founder, with the somewhat earlier date 1581-1580. Most of the traditions call Cecrops a son of earth, implying that he was autochthonous, but the Parian Marble<sup>6</sup> mentions an earlier kingship founded by an autochthonous Actaeon, and one late author says that Cecrops came from Egypt.<sup>7</sup> Very likely he was the leader of the first of the Viking bands to descend on Greece from the eastern seas. His name is a personal one and gives no hint as to whether he belonged to the *Danaoi* or to some other tribe or race.

The last of the Late Helladic invaders was Pelops, a contemporary of Perseus. The traditions concerning him and his origin<sup>8</sup> are more

<sup>1</sup> Ep. 7, l. 12. See Jacoby, *op. cit.*, p. 38, for parallel accounts.

<sup>2</sup> Apoll. *Bibl.*, III, 1, 1; III, 4, 1; for variants on the legend, cf. Frazer's commentary, Apoll. (Loeb Library), I, pp. 296 ff., note 2.

<sup>3</sup> IX, 12, 2.

<sup>4</sup> S. A. Cook, *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, II, p. 378, places the rise of the maritime power of Semitic Phoenicia in the thirteenth-twelfth centuries B.C. <sup>5</sup> Ep. 1, l. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Ep. 1, ll. 5-7. Cf. Jacoby, *op. cit.*, on the pre-Cecropian kings of Attica. Pausanias (I, 5, 3) and Apollodorus (*Bibl.* III, 14, 2) say that Cecrops married the daughter of Actaeon.

<sup>7</sup> Schol. Aristoph., *Plut.*, 773.

<sup>8</sup> See Frazer's bibliography of the Pelops legend, Apoll. (Loeb Library), II, p. 157, note 4.



confused than in the other cases, and we hear little of his descendants save for the brothers Atreus and Thyestes, who enter into the Argive cycle. Probably this is due to the fact that the Dorian invasion very effectually broke the cultural continuity of the greater part of Greece, so that it is only in the Argolid, where the cult and traditions of the Heraeum remained intact, in Attica, where the Dorians never came, and to some degree in Boeotia, where the Aeolic dialect shows the persistence of the older race, that we can expect to find full chronicles of the Late Helladic families. Apparently Pelops was a Lydian or Phrygian<sup>1</sup> who came by way of Lesbos to the Isthmus of Corinth, and after conquering most of the Peloponnesus made himself king of Olympia. So far as we are told, he did not establish any dynasty there.

Only the royal houses of Argos, Athens, Thebes, and the Pelopids claimed an immigrant ancestry. By far the greater part of the rest of the legendary heroes of Greece, when content with human ancestry, seem to have descended from the seven sons of Aeolus. The Aeolians were, I suppose, that section of the Middle Helladic invasion which, instead of pushing directly south, like the Achaeans of the Peloponnesus, lingered in Phocis and Boeotia. Nestor and Tyndareus, among others, were said to be descendants of Aeolus.<sup>2</sup> From this it is reasonable to infer that the chieftains of Pylos and of Sparta in Late Helladic times were of the older stock, though the presence of tholos tombs at both sites shows that the culture of the Danaans had, by intermarriage or by contact, become dominant there as well. By the time of the Trojan War the two races had become so completely fused that the tribal name of the Argive leaders could be applied to the whole host of the Greeks.

If we accept the indications of Greek tradition as to the eastern origin of the *Danaoi* and related invaders, and turn to Egypt, we find records there which fortunately take up the tale. Inscriptions<sup>3</sup> of Rameses III tell of a great confederation of "the nine peoples of the

<sup>1</sup> Hall, *J. H. S.*, XXIX (1909), pp. 19 ff. considers it not improbable that the story of Pelops reflects an actual invasion of Greece by Hittites.

<sup>2</sup> For descendants of Aeolus, cf. Diod. Sic., IV, 67, 2-7; Schol. on Pindar, *Pyth.*, IV, 107 (190). For Tyndareus and Nestor, Apoll. *Bibl.*, I, 7, 3; I, 9, 5-9.

<sup>3</sup> In temple of Medinet Habu, Greene, *Fouilles*, II, 16-18; Champollion, *Mon.*, 222, 224; Bossert, *Alt Kreta*, p. 55, 5. All the Egyptian texts referred to in this paper are conveniently collected and translated into German by Bossert, *op. cit.*

bow and the foreigners of the isles" formed in 1194, — just about the traditional time of the siege of Troy, — which overran the Hittites, Kode, Karkemish, Arzawa, and Alesia. The kingdom of the Hittites extended a long tongue, at that time, south into Syria on the east of the Lebanon. Kode was the land of the sea-coast which flanked it on the west, as Karkemish did on the east. Arzawa was Cilicia or the land north of it. Alesia was Cyprus or the Cilician coast.<sup>1</sup> The order in which these countries are named suggests that the movement was from south to north — unless it be an Egyptian practice to name the nearest countries first. The confederates then assembled in a great camp in Amor, — just to the north of Palestine, — and marched by land and sea against Egypt. The most important of these peoples seems to have been the *Perset* (or *Pulusati*). They are included in all five of the Egyptian lists of the allies, and in four of these their name comes first. Besides this, the name occurs alone on two other inscriptions of Rameses III. Closely linked with the *Perset*, and of almost equal importance, come the *Zeker* (*Tchakaray*) and the *Denyen* (*Daanau* or *Danauna*). Of somewhat less importance are the *Shekeresh* and the *Wesesh*, and last come the *Teresh* and the *Sherden*. The *Wesesh* and the *Teresh* are specifically called sea people. These hordes met the Egyptian forces and were overthrown by them somewhere between the Delta and Mt. Lebanon.

In recounting his victory, the king boasts that "the *Perset* are shut up in their cities" and that he "killed the *Denyen* in their islands (or coast lands)." It is evident that by this defeat the *Perset* and the *Denyen*, and probably the *Zeker*, were driven back to the cities and lands where they had dwelt before they started on their adventure against Egypt. Now the *Perset* (*Pulusati*) are generally admitted to be the Philistines, who are known to have been occupying, a little later, the southern coast of Palestine.<sup>2</sup> And from a letter<sup>3</sup> of the time

<sup>1</sup> Hall has abandoned his earlier identification of Alesia (Alashiya) with Cyprus (*B. S. A.*, VIII (1901-02), pp. 167 ff.) in favor of Cilicia (*Anc. Hist. of Near East*, p. 243, note 2). Wainwright thinks it Syria (*Klio*, XIV (1914-15) pp. 1-36).

<sup>2</sup> In the time of Joshua (13, 2 ff.) they are the lords of Ashdod, Ascalon, Ekron, Gath, and Gaza. By A. S. Cook's chronology (*Camb. Anc. Hist.*, I, p. 166), this should be in the thirteenth century B.C.

<sup>3</sup> Papyrus in Galenischeff collection, Ungnad-Ranke, *Altorientalische Texte*, 1910, pp. 225 ff.; Bossert, *op. cit.*, p. 52, II.

of Rameses XII (1115-1090), we know that the Zeker then possessed the city of Dor on the coast of Sharon, just to the north of the Philistine territory. If these two tribes were in the same locations before the confederation of 1194, as seems clear from the Egyptian records, we should expect their close allies, the Denyen, to have been just to the north of the Zeker, that is, along what is later known as the Phoenician coast. There is inconclusive confirmation of this conjecture in one of the Amarna letters<sup>1</sup> written from Byblos in the first half of the fourteenth century, which speaks of a people at that time located there, whose name is read "Danuna." This reading, though generally accepted, is not certain, being partially a restoration. If it be correct, it probably refers to those later called Denyen, and indicates that they, and very likely their comrades the Zeker and Perset also, were settled in Syria at least as early as the fourteenth century.

The rest of the tribes allied against Rameses III were probably all sea fighters. The *Sherden* are well known from other records<sup>2</sup> as the chief mercenary troops — apparently the "marines," of the Egyptians — from the fourteenth to the eleventh centuries. If they had any fixed dwelling, there is no indication as to where it was. The *Sherden*, *Shekeresh*, and *Teresh* appeared about 1220 B.C.,<sup>3</sup> associated on that occasion with *Ekwesh* and *Rek (Luku)*, as allies of the Libyans in an invasion of the Delta from the west. The *Ekwesh* are specifically called "*Ekwesh of the Sea Lands*." In one of the Amarna letters<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Knudtzon, *El-Amarna Tablets*, p. 513; Bossert, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-63. There is a temptation to see some connection, in name at least, between the Danuna and Dan. Dan was the northernmost tribe of Israel, its territory reaching as far as Joppa, and apparently it alone of the Israelitish peoples took to the sea (Judges, 5, 17). Perhaps Danite sea-farers were in the service of the Philistines and migrated with them, — the tribe disappears from later Hebrew history, — or possibly one section of the Philistines occupied territory that had belonged to Dan, and so were called Danuna.

<sup>2</sup> (a) Papyrus Anastasi, II (London); (b) Battle of Kadesh, in trans. *Alte Orient*, Jahrg. XX (1919); Roeder, *Aegypter und Heiter*, pp. 26 ff.; (c) Papyrus Anastasi I (London); A. H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Hieratic Texts*, pt. I, p. 19; (d) Inscr. in temple of Medinet Habu, Rosellini, *Mon. Storici*, 125; (e) Greater Harris Papyrus (London), Breasted, *Anc. Records*, IV, 403; (f) Inscr. in Cairo, transcribed by von Sethe. (All in Bossert, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-52.)

<sup>3</sup> Inscr. at Karnak, Mariette, pl. 52-54; Bossert, *op. cit.*, p. 54, I.

<sup>4</sup> Knudtzon, *El-Amarna tablets*, I, pp. 278 ff.; Bossert, *op. cit.*, p. 61, VI.



two centuries before, we are told that the men of *Lukki* had been raiding Egypt and forcibly settling in *Alashia*. And in the early thirteenth century the *Rek* appear among the allies of the Hittites at the battle of Kadesh.<sup>1</sup> There is general agreement in identifying them as Lycians. Of the *Shekeresh*, *Teresh*, and *Ekwesh* we really know nothing except that the last two were sea peoples, and that at times *Teresh* served in the Egyptian army. From their appearance with the Libyans, to the west of the Delta, it is safe to infer that they all came from the western part of what the Egyptians called "the Great Circle of the Sea" (that is, the eastern Mediterranean), probably from Lycia, Caria, Rhodes, or the eastern end of Crete. The *Sherden*, *Shekeresh*, and *Teresh* have been popularly identified with the Sardinians, Sicilians, and Tyrsenians; and as it is highly improbable that they came from farther west than Crete, it is further suggested<sup>2</sup> that in the thirteenth century they were Asiatics who, having reached the Mediterranean from Sardis in Lydia and Sagleessos in Pisidia, were eventually to sail out to the western lands with which they are identified. The *Ekwesh* (*Achaiwasha*) have similarly been identified with the *Achaioi* of Greece. Phonetically this serves; practically, I suspect that the allies all came from too close and limited an area to include any Greeks. If the *Ekwesh* really were Achaeans, they were probably from Crete or Asia Minor, like the rest. The truth is we know as little about them as about the *Wesesh*. They are both sea people, they appear about a quarter of a century apart — the *Ekwesh* at the attack on the Delta from the west, the *Wesesh*, with the same maritime allies, at the attack from the east. A profound interest in the Achaeans has led to a general acceptance of an uncertain identification in the one case, but in the other, since no dramatic identification has been suggested, none has been generally accepted.<sup>3</sup>

Similarly, the identification of the Denyen with the *Danaoi* has met

<sup>1</sup> *Alte Orient*, Jahrg. XX (1919); Roeder, *Aegypter und Hetiter*, pp. 26 ff.; Bossert, *op. cit.*, p. 54, I.

<sup>2</sup> First by Maspero, *Rev. Critique*, IX (1880), p. 109.

<sup>3</sup> For all these identifications see *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, II, ch. XII and p. 488; also Hall, *Oldest Civilization of Greece*, pp. 171 ff., and note to p. 179 in Addenda, p. 322. Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 177, derives the *Wesesh* (*Ouashasha*) from the town of *Waxos* or *Oaxas* in Crete, A. J. Reinach, *op. cit.*, p. 37, brings them from *Ouassos* near Halicarnassus.

with general approval, but in this case the Greek tradition of an immigrant Danaos strongly supports it.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately we know nothing of their personal appearance or costume, though several of their allies are depicted on Egyptian monuments.<sup>2</sup> The Zeker and the Perset, with whom they seem most closely associated, as well as their less important allies the Teresh and the Wesesh, all wear high feather crowns. The Zeker are handsome men of marked European type, with straight noses and pointed beards quite in the archaic Greek fashion. The Perset and Sherden are shown together in an elaborate picture of a sea-fight. Both are beardless, both seem to be European types, though the Perset have a slightly Semitic cast, while the Sherden have frankly up-turned noses. Both wear corselets of some kind and carry rather small round shields and heavy triangular swords. The latter may be simply thrusting swords of the Cretan pattern, but the greater breadth of the blade suggests that they may have been used for chopping also. Instead of feather crowns, the Sherden wear stiff helmets, in shape much like German trench helmets, with two horns attached to each.

The parallel of these types with the two sets of warriors on the "Warrior Vase" from Mycenae<sup>3</sup> may be purely coincidence, but it is certainly striking. The drawing on the vase is very crude, but it is clear that, while the artist has intended to represent a single type of body-covering and greaves, and probably shields also, for both his troops, yet he unquestionably meant to show two kinds of head-gear. One troop wears stiff helmets which project before the forehead and down behind the neck. These rise in the centre to form a crest, from which a plume hangs to the rear, while from the front part of the helmet project a pair of slender horns. The head-gear of the other troop has a straight line at the bottom, as if it started from a band fitted tightly around the head. Thence it spreads outward and upward, and

<sup>1</sup> Wainwright, *Liverpool Ann.* VI (1913-14), p. 64, note 4, says "The Greek legend, which makes Danaos the son of Belos (Syrian Baal), and thus cousin of Phoenix and Cilix, receives strong confirmation from this occurrence of the Danuna in Syria in the XIV century B.C."

<sup>2</sup> Sculptures of Rameses III, Medinet Habu; cf. Bossert, *op. cit.*, figs. 263-264, after Burchardt, *Fremdvölkerexpedition*, 485, 457; Hall, *Oldest Civilization of Greece*, figs. 50-51; Fimmen, *Die Kretisch-Mykenische Kultur*, figs. 187, 188; Bissing-Bruckmann, *Denkm. Ägypt. Sculpt.*, pls. 93-95.

<sup>3</sup> Furtwängler-Loeschke, *Mykenische Vasen*, pls. 42, 43.

along the top a row of little radiating lines is painted. The impression is somewhat that of a fur cap, but the fact that it spreads at the top, instead of following the form of the head, makes this improbable. Actually it is closer in appearance to the feather crowns of the Perset than to any other head-gear I know.<sup>1</sup> Unlike the Perset and the Sherden, both Mycenaean troops are bearded; in this respect they resemble the Zeker, and the shaft-grave kings.

It has been remarked that the Old Testament hero of the Philistines, Goliath,<sup>2</sup> clad in bronze corselet and greaves, bears a strange resemblance to the warriors of the Homeric epic. If the tradition be accepted that the ancestors of the Homeric heroes, Danaus, Cadmus, Cecrops, and Perseus, came from the eastern end of the Mediterranean, from the tribes of the Denyen and Perset (the older Philistines), the strangeness entirely disappears. Perseus, from Joppa, was perhaps an ancestor of Goliath.

It is impossible to say how widely the feather head-dress was to be found in the late bronze age. The Phaestus disk shows heads with a crest which somewhat resembles this crown, but the land of origin of these hieroglyphs is unknown — it is generally held that they are not Cretan.<sup>3</sup> A silver rhyton from one of the shaft graves at Mycenae represents a group of naked warriors defending their town from the attack of sea-raiders; according to Hall,<sup>4</sup> the defenders wear feather

<sup>1</sup> I am informed that A. D. Frazer, in a dissertation written at Harvard some years ago, but never published, suggested that the head-gear represented on the "Warrior Vase" might be feather-crowns. A. J. Reinach, *Le disque de Phaestos*, in *Rev. Arch.* 1910, p. 22, note 2, considers it a cap of animal skin. It is possible that a geometric vase from Mycenae (Wide, *Arch. Jahrb.* XIV, 1899, p. 85, fig. 44) also represents feather crowns, as Pernier suggests (*Il disco de Phaestos, Ausonia III*, 1908-09, pp. 255-302). Wainwright, *Liverpool Ann.* VI (1913-14), p. 76, cites the head-dresses on this vase as an indication of close connections between Greece and Asia Minor at the close of the Mycenaean period. He also notes the similarity between the helmet crests on the "Warrior Vase" and Syrian crests of the XVth century recalls that crests are named by Herodotus as Carian.

<sup>2</sup> I Samuel, 17, 4 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Evans, *Palace of Minos*, I, pp. 649 ff. A. J. Reinach, *op. cit.*, *passim*, believes that it is the work of the "Peoples of the Sea," i.e. Indo-Europeans in western Asia Minor — Carians, Lycians or allied folk.

<sup>4</sup> *J. H. S.*, XXXI (1911), pp. 119 ff.; I cannot feel entirely certain that feather crowns are shown here. For other similar head-dresses, see the example from Aegina (Marshall, *Cat. of Jewelry in Brit. Mus.*, pl. VII, 762) and the ivory carving from



crowns. We cannot be sure whether this object is of local workmanship or an importation from Crete, and consequently cannot tell where the scene is supposed to be laid. At Piskokephalo in eastern Crete a small terra-cotta head,<sup>1</sup> of the end of L. M. I has been found, which wears a feather crown not unlike that of the Perset and Zeker except that the feathers curl in at the top instead of out. This is certainly not a usual Cretan head-dress, and this lone example may represent a foreigner. At a later date Herodotus<sup>2</sup> describes the Lycian sea-warriors in the forces of the Persian King as wearing hats "encircled with plumes." Altogether, it seems probable that, like their allies the *Sherden*, *Shekesh*, and *Teresh*, the *Derden*, *Zeker*, and *Perset* had once been pirates of the south coast of Asia Minor, who had migrated or established colonies on the coast of Palestine some time before Rameses III (1292-1225). In view of their profiles, it seems unlikely that they had come to the mainland from Crete. Their possible appearance in Cretan art seems much more probably due to raids which they had conducted from Lycia or from Palestine upon the rich cities of the island.

According to Sir Arthur Evans,<sup>3</sup> the palaces of both Knossos and Phaestos were destroyed at the end of M. M. II (c. 1700), and for a time perhaps left uninhabited. But except for the possible introduction of a new ethnic strain, the culture of Crete was not affected. Who were the destroyers, and whence did they come? Zakro, Palaikastro, and Gournia<sup>4</sup> all suffered a similar fate toward the end of L. M. I (c. 1500). Palaikastro was reoccupied, but Zakro definitely abandoned.

Enkomi (Murray, *Excav. in Cyprus*, pl. I; Furtwängler, *Gemmen*, III, 439 ff.; Poulsen, *Jahrb. d. Inst.*, 1911, pp. 230 ff.). Cf. my article on Mycenaean feather crowns, "*Mycenaean Plumes*," to appear shortly in *A. J. A.*

<sup>1</sup> Now in Candia Museum; Val. K. Müller, *Der Polos*, pl. I; *Jahrb. d. archaeol. Inst.*, 1915, p. 277, 2; Bossert, *op. cit.*, pl. 141. Müller considers this high head-dress to be hair instead of feathers. At first he dated it M. M. I, but now considers it not earlier than L. M. I (*Ibid.*, XLII (1927), p. 23, note 5).

<sup>2</sup> VII, 92. A. J. Reinach, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-27, notes the feather crown on the patron deity of Sardinia, "*Sardus Pater*," in classic times, and still earlier the representation of crowns with incurving feathers, like that on the L. M. I. head from Piskokephalo. He believes that both Sardinians and crowns came from the east.

<sup>3</sup> *Palace of Minos*, I, p. 315.

<sup>4</sup> Boyd-Hawes, *Gournia*, p. 23; for Palaikastro and Zakro, *B. S. A.*, IX (1902), p. 281.

Phaestus, too, was sacked at about the same time. Then at the end of L. M. II (c. 1400) Palaikastro was destroyed for good and all, and the great palace of Knossos plundered and ruined.<sup>1</sup> The common opinion seems to be that the series of raids which eventually overthrew the civilization of Crete emanated from the Peloponnesus, perhaps were Achæan in origin. But the early date at which these raids begin, coupled with the fact that it is the east end of the island which suffers first and most severely, seems to point more logically to the Luku or some of their piratical allies, whose activities in the eastern Mediterranean is established as early as the fourteenth century. I should consider these raids part of the same folk movement from east to west that brought the Danaoi from "Egypt" and the Cyclops from Lycia to Greece.

The correlation of known facts and probabilities suggests that the legend of Europa and her relations has a foundation more solid than mere myth. Europa<sup>2</sup> was born in Phœnicia, — though probably the Greeks never considered her of that Semitic Phœnician race they later knew, — first cousin to Danaus and Aegyptus, and sister to Cadmus, Cilix, and Phoenix. She was carried to Crete; Danaus, followed by the sons of Egypt, migrated to Greece, as we have seen, and her three brothers, voyaging in search of her, became the founders of Thebes in Boeotia, Cilicia, and Phœnicia. In Crete three sons of Europa were born. One of these, Minos, became the great lord of Knossos; a second, Sarpedon, crossed to Lycia and became king there; while the third, fair-haired Rhadamanthus, continued westward to the kingdom of his uncle Cadmus.

The Parian Chronicle<sup>3</sup> places Minos and the first working of iron on Mount Ida in the fifteenth century. Egypt we know had begun to use iron by the beginning of the thirteenth century.<sup>4</sup> At that time it was imported with some difficulty from the Hittite mines in Cappadocia; how long before this the Hittites had used it, is unknown. It seems quite as possible that the occasional pre-Dorian use of iron in

<sup>1</sup> Wace, *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, II, p. 445.

<sup>2</sup> *Apoll. Bibl.*, III, 1, 1 ff.; cf. Frazer's commentary, *Apoll.* (Loeb Library), I, pp. 296-303, notes.

<sup>3</sup> *Ep.* 11, ll. 21-22.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. letter from Hattushil to Rameses II relating to shipments of iron to Egypt, found at Boghaz-keui, Luckenbill, *A. J. S. L.*, XXXVII (1920-21), p. 206.

Greece was an introduction from the east as that it came from the north.<sup>1</sup> The fair hair of Rhadamanthus, with the round shields, and the helmets and greaves of the coast-dwellers of Palestine, completes the list of supposedly northern characteristics which distinguish later Mycenaean and Homeric culture from the earlier civilization of Crete and the shaft-grave Mycenaeans.<sup>2</sup>

But even if these characteristics reached Greece immediately from the east, it is very probable that ultimately they did come from the north; for there is excellent evidence that in the thirteenth century, at least, there were constant migrations from Thrace across the straits and south-east through Asia Minor to Cilicia. Rameses II<sup>3</sup> (1292-1225) enumerates among the allies of the Hittite king at the battle of Kadesh, *Arzawa*, *Pedes*, *Derden*, *Mes*, *Elwen* (*Mawen?*), *Kelkesh*, *Keshkesh*, and *Luku*. All these peoples dwelt to the west of the Hittite kingdom, since none of them appears in any Assyrian records. The *Arzawa* lay farthest south, in the Taurus mountains, or on the coast. The others have been equated with the Pedassians, Dardanians, Mysians, Ilians (or Maeonians), Cilicians, Cyzicenes, and Lycians.<sup>4</sup> Thus all might be from the northwest corner of Asia Minor — for in the Homeric poems there are Cilicians on the gulf of Adramyttium, Lycians on the Aesepus, and Mysians on both sides of the straits. Moreover, if the name *Alakshandush*, given in the Boghaz-keui tablets<sup>5</sup> as that of a king of *Arzawa* at the beginning of the fourteenth century, be the same as the Greek *Alexandros*, as seems probable, it ap-

<sup>1</sup> "The earliest iron weapons in the Aegean are in east Crete, in the early transitional period . . . the Cretan iron appears in a type of sword which comes from the north . . . it is possible that these swords were made of the Asiatic iron . . . as a similar sword from Egypt certainly is: it bears the cartouche of Seti II." Wade-Gery, in *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, II, p. 524.

<sup>2</sup> The Asiatic origin of Mycenaean civilization was propounded by Köhler, *Kuppelgrab von Menidi*, as early as 1878, and continued to be discussed for twenty years (cf. Schuckhardt, *Schliemann's Excavations*, chap. 6), but since Ridgeway's *Early Age of Greece*, seems to have been almost wholly discredited.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 84, note 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, II, pp. 281, 488; cf. Hall, *B. S. A.*, VIII (1902), pp. 175 ff.; Pythian-Adams, *Bull. B. S. Arch. in Jerusalem*, No. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Luckenbill, *Class. Phil.*, VI (1911), pp. 85 ff.; Kretschmer, *Glotta*, XIII (1924), pp. 205 ff.



pears that even these southernmost allies were of northern "Greek-speaking" stock.

Even without the excellent evidence that has been adduced by Myres and others,<sup>1</sup> it is obvious that from the beginning of the bronze age there must have been an important trade-route running from Cilicia north through Pisidia and Lydia to the straits, and on to Thrace, by which the northern barbarians got the copper of Cyprus for their weapons. And just as it seems to me natural that Middle Helladic invaders from the head of the Adriatic should push south, along the western copper route in Greece, toward "lands beyond" which were to them the source of riches, so it seems inevitable that the lure of wealth should have continually led nomadic warrior tribes from Thrace along the Anatolian copper road to the eastern Mediterranean, and then by the Syrian coast toward the treasure-house of Egypt, or, more perilously by sea, to the rich and ill-defended cities of the Aegean.

The preliminary reading of the Boghaz-keui tablets<sup>2</sup> indicates the presence of Achaeans (*Ahhiyawā-Aḫaiḫoi*) in Asia Minor in the thirteenth century — perhaps the same people as the *Ekwesh* discussed above, and the ancestors of the Cilicians who, Herodotus says, were anciently called *Hypachaeans*. If this be correct, the existence of the same people on both sides of the Aegean may be explained in three ways: they may have migrated to Asia from Greece, or to Greece from Asia, or they may have come in two divergent streams from some common source in neither country.<sup>3</sup> The first explanation seems to be

<sup>1</sup> Myres, *Copper and Bronze Age in Cyprus*, in *Journ. Anth. Inst.*, XXVII (1897), pp. 171 ff.; Lichtenberg, *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte von Kypros*, in *Mitth. d. Vorderas. Ges.* II (1906), pp. 72 ff.; Ormerod, *B. S. A.*, XVI (1909-10), p. 105.

<sup>2</sup> Forrer, *Mitth. deutsch. Orient-Gesellschaft*, 1924, No. 63, pp. 1-22.

<sup>3</sup> "Tous les Peuples de la Mer qui apparaissent sous Ramsès II (v. 1260) à côté des *Louki* parmi les alliés des Hétéens ont laissé leur trace dans l'angle N.-O. de l'Asie Mineure, en Mysie, à Ilion, Gergis, Dardanos et Pédasos. En admettant que tel fut, en effet, leur habitat à cette époque et en remarquant qu'aucun d'entre eux ne reparait dans les deux grands attaques — les chariots des *Pélêshêta* (*Perset*) et leur établissement subséquent en Philistide montrent qu'il s'agit d'une véritable migration — que les Peuples de la Mer tentent contre l'Egypte sous Merenphthah (v. 1220) et sous Ramsès III (v. 1190), on doit se demander si celles-ci ne sont pas le résultat de l'entrée en jeu dans l'Asie Mineure occidentale d'un élément nouveau, la conséquence de la poussée qui s'exerçait par la descente des Indo-Européens ap-

most generally accepted to-day,<sup>1</sup> the second was suggested by Curtius<sup>2</sup> a half-century ago, and seems to have received much less consideration than it deserves, but to me the third explanation seems the most probable, in view of what has been said, and particularly because any migration by ship across the Aegean in either direction, in the bronze age, in sufficient numbers to establish a permanent race-name and language, is hardly probable.

It appears to me, therefore, that the outline of pre-history which can be traced from our present archaeological knowledge, in combination with the classical traditions and the natural history of migrations, is briefly this: an Aegean people inhabiting Greece in the Early Helladic period was overwhelmed about 1900 B.C. by a migration of Greek-speaking northerners from the head of the Adriatic; except in scattered localities, the language was fundamentally changed by the numerically superior mass of the newcomers, who, however, probably did not spread beyond the mainland. Another land migration of Greek-speaking people, perhaps of the same stock and at about the same time as the other, crossed from Thrace to the Troad, and worked its way gradually, and probably in separate sections, toward the southeast. Before the end of the sixteenth century these wanderers reached the frontiers of Egypt, and finding their way effectually barred there, took to the sea. Their movements thereupon changed from mass migration to piratic raids, leading in some cases to the establishment of military colonies. Crete was thus pillaged and possessed, but the new masters were not sufficiently numerous to affect the native language or culture materially, save to induce degeneration of the latter. Pushing farther west, successive waves of these marauders reached the mainland of Greece during the fifteenth century, and in the same way established themselves there. Booty from Crete and Cretan workmen, carried to Greece, gave magnificence to the new monarchies; but probably there was little change in the underlying civilization, save for the introduction of the culture of wheat and the concomitant worship of the Fertility-goddess from the

partenant aux rameaux phrygien et achéen, tant en Grèce qu'en Asie Mineure," A. J. Reinach, *Rev. Arch.*, XV (1910), pp. 53-54.

<sup>1</sup> So Buck, *Classical Philology*, XXI (1926), p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> *Griechische Geschichte*, I, pp. 28 ff.; *Ioner vor der Ionischen Wanderung*, *passim*.

east. In Central and Northern Greece the evidence of conquest is more striking than in the Peloponnese, for the gradual development, under Cretan influence, from Middle Helladic pottery to that of L. H. III is not found. In Boeotia, Thebes alone produced typical pottery of L. H. I and II; in Thessaly it has been found only in graves, probably imported. Elsewhere the characteristic Middle Helladic types give place suddenly to the very different types of L. H. III.<sup>1</sup> Both conquered and conquerors spoke dialects of Greek, probably much alike. The leaders continued their warlike habits, they introduced the art of fortification, learned in Syria or Asia Minor and carried through the Cyclades, and their palaces became great strongholds, from which they spread their conquests by land and sea, until at the beginning of the tenth century, a new migration of Greek-speaking northerners, relatively untouched by Aegean civilization, but possessing iron weapons, swept over the land and engulfed it in the dark ages which separate legendary from historic Greece.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. H. Goldman, *Excavations of Eutresis*, in *Notes of Fogg Art Museum*, Harvard University, Sept. 1927, pp. 45-46, and note 1.



## DEMOSTHENES, SON OF ALCISTHENES

By ERIC CHARLES WOODCOCK

DEMOSTHENES, the son of Alcisthenes, is one of the most interesting and tragic figures in the history of fifth-century Greece. He is interesting, because we can see in his career the development of the greatest military capacity that Athens or Sparta, with the possible exception of Brasidas, produced throughout the Peloponnesian War. He is tragic, because the fruits of his capacity and enterprise, and finally his life, were thrown away by blundering politicians and incompetent colleagues. Modern historians have all recognized his military capacity, but his real significance and worth have never been truly appreciated because it has been assumed that Thucydides' account of him is not only that of an unbiased historian, but of an ardent admirer. Thucydides may have admired Demosthenes' ability and energy, but that he disapproved of him is obvious in every line of his narrative. How the effect of this disapproval has been overlooked, when so much has been written on Thucydides' attitude towards Cleon, is inexplicable.

That the account of certain episodes and of certain characters in Thucydides' History presents puzzles and inconsistencies to the thoughtful reader, is proved by the controversies which have arisen. These controversies have centered chiefly in the account of Cleon and of the episodes with which he was connected, and various theories have been put forward to account for, or to explain away Thucydides' apparent lapse from his high ideal of scientific impartiality. These explanations may be summed up under the following four heads: (1) A personal grudge against Cleon, (2) A grudge against Athens, (3) A dramatic theory of history, (4) Political bias.

Professor Bury states quite bluntly that Thucydides had a personal grudge against Cleon.<sup>1</sup> Mr. F. M. Cornford traces the alleged distortion of the narrative to a dramatic theory of history that Thucydides is trying to illustrate. He asserts that Thucydides really saw an agency

<sup>1</sup> J. B. Bury, *History of Greece*, p. 456.

called Fortune at work, especially during the period of Athenian successes; that the whole narrative is intended to illustrate the contrast of human foresight (*γνώμη*) and non-human Fortune (*τύχη*), which are the sole determinant factors in a series of human events; and that the effect of this theory is shown most clearly in the distortion and dramatization of the career of Cleon.<sup>1</sup> Mr. W. R. M. Lamb, on the other hand, is more inclined to accept Thucydides' narrative at its face value. He maintains that if the reader is left with the impression that the Athenian success at Pylos was due to luck, it is because Thucydides himself failed to see what underlay some of these strokes of luck, and not through his design.<sup>2</sup> The further suggestion is put forward that the cause of Thucydides' apparent bias against Cleon should be sought in his political sympathies rather than in personal animosity.<sup>3</sup> Which of these theories is the most likely, cannot be decided by concrete evidence, but the examination of Thucydides' account of Demosthenes, a most important member of Cleon's party, may at least throw light on either the first or the fourth explanation of Thucydides' attitude.

When Demosthenes first appears in the pages of Thucydides, the Peloponnesian War had been raging for five years. Athens, having lost the guiding hand of Pericles, and with her forces decimated by the plague, had not yet ventured to depart from the cautious policy he had laid down. It is significant that with the entry of Demosthenes the war took on a new and more vigorous character. "The same summer (B.C. 426) the Athenians sent thirty ships round the Peloponnese under the command of Demosthenes, son of Alcisthenes, and of Procles, son of Theodorus." These are the words with which Thucydides introduces him. The details of Demosthenes' earlier career are unknown, but this was his first large commission as a general, as is further indicated by the inexperience he displayed in carrying it out. But at the same time he showed an originality and boldness of conception which, when combined with experience, were to obtain results of the greatest importance for Athens.

Thucydides' account of the Aetolian expedition on which he immediately embarked, is full of implied criticism. He also adds that De-

<sup>1</sup> F. M. Cornford, *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, pp. 79 ff.

<sup>2</sup> W. R. M. Lamb, *Clio Enthroned*, p. 53.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

mosthenes had already in mind a grand scheme for opening a way into Locris, in order to attack Boeotia from the north and to bring the Corinthian gulf into communication with the Euboean strait.<sup>1</sup> Since even the attack on Aetolia is regarded as ill-advised, these further extravagant projects seem to be attributed to Demosthenes in order to lead the reader to regard him as a reckless megalomaniac. And yet it must be admitted that when Thucydides makes a statement with such conviction, he usually has evidence for it, and the graphic and detailed description of the disastrous Athenian retreat has led to the attractive suggestion that Thucydides himself was on service in those regions; in which case he may have learned Demosthenes' ideas from his own lips.

Demosthenes made the only great blunder of his career when he failed to await his Ozolian allies at Teichium. He was quite ignorant of the Aetolian methods of fighting, and he discovered that his hoplites were at a total disadvantage in the face of the attacks of swarms of light-armed troops. Almost half of the Athenian hoplites were lost, the very best men, as Thucydides remarks, that the Athenians had in the whole war. Why he lays so much stress on the loss of a hundred and twenty hoplites, when Athens lost thousands in other seats of war, is a mystery.

Thucydides does not tell us what Demosthenes' orders were when he was put in charge of his fleet, but there is little doubt that he went far beyond them in making this expedition. The specific reason for the sending of the fleet round the Peloponnese was undoubtedly to protect Naupactus, for this was the most important possession of Athens in Greece outside of Attica, and it was seriously threatened by the inroads of the Aetolians, who had already sent to Sparta and obtained the promise of a force to help them.<sup>2</sup> But there was probably added to this a general commission to protect the interests of Athens in those regions, by which Demosthenes may have felt himself authorized to act. Whether his real object was as impracticable and foolish as Thucydides' narrative would lead us to believe, is hard to decide. It is difficult to judge the practicability of an enterprise in the light of defeat. In this Thucydides seems to be no exception to the rule, for

<sup>1</sup> Thuc., III, 95.

<sup>2</sup> Thuc., III, 100. *προπέμψαντες πρότερον* — i.e., before Demosthenes' expedition



the blindness and gullibility that he attributes to Demosthenes are utterly at variance with the latter's subsequent actions.

But Demosthenes had been taught a severe lesson: he had, in fact, learned two lessons which he was destined to put to good use, and one of which was destined later to alter the whole character of Greek warfare. He did not have long to wait for a chance to render a signal service to Athens, and so compensate somewhat for his defeat. The fact that the danger from which he saved her was of his own making was almost obscured by the brilliance and completeness of his success.

The Aetolians, as has been mentioned already, had previously applied for a force of Peloponnesians from Sparta, and the hopes of success aroused by their victory induced the Spartans to respond. Demosthenes had the utmost difficulty in persuading the alienated Acarnanians to help him save Naupactus. He succeeded, however, in warding off the consequences of his own defeat, but he did not accomplish enough to make it safe for him to return to Athens, or to re-instate himself in the eyes of the Athenians. What he needed was a startling success which would revive the prestige of Athens in those regions and effectually prevent the Peloponnesians from ousting her. The Spartan general Eurylochus, although prevented from capturing Naupactus, had by no means ceased to be dangerous. The Ambracians had sent to him to ask his aid in making an attack on the Acarnanians and Amphilochian Argos. If this town could be brought over, the Peloponnesians could hold the Athenian allies in check and again dominate the entrance to the Corinthian gulf, Corinthian corn-ships could again enter, and the Athenian blockade would be broken.

Faced with this danger, the Acarnanians seem to have been assailed by a sudden diffidence in their own capacity to deal with it, for they sent a hurried message to Demosthenes at Naupactus, asking him to come and take command of their forces. This opportunity to make good must have seemed to him an answer to his prayers. But when, in spite of all precautions, Eurylochus managed to join his allies, Demosthenes had a large combined force to oppose, which was stiffened by Peloponnesian hoplites, was under a skilled Spartan commander, and which, moreover, was expecting a large reinforcement. That in the face of such odds, and with so little experience at his command, he was able to outwit an expert opponent and gain a crushing victory

shows beyond doubt that, in tactics at least, his military capacity was of the highest order. But when the battle had been won, and the remnant of his opponents isolated, his secret treaty with Menedaeus shows that he was also an astute diplomatist. The annihilation of the Ambracian reinforcement completed his success, and showed, incidentally, that he had put to good use the lesson he had learned in Aetolia. That the Ambraciots could encamp on one of the hills at Idomene in utter ignorance of the fact that Demosthenes' men had occupied the other one, is a startling comment on the warfare of this period. The imbecility of marching boldly, without reconnoitring, through an apparently friendly territory when an enemy is near, was amply proved by their destruction. The Greeks, it would appear, had not yet learned the use of scouts, and they seemed incapable of learning by experience. Demosthenes was an exception.

The results of his success were not, indeed, as great as might have been expected. Ambracia might have been taken without a blow, but the Acarnanians, fearing, as Thucydides expresses it, lest the Athenians prove worse neighbors than the Ambracians, concluded a defensive alliance with the latter for a hundred years, on the understanding that both should remain neutral for the rest of the war. Athenian interests, however, were henceforth secure in the Corinthian gulf.

If Demosthenes had had any political following, he should now have been able to direct Athens' war policy and bring the war to a successful conclusion. As it was, he was able to become no more than a military adviser to a party whose leaders were of a capacity inferior to his own. His political insignificance, therefore, prevented his efforts, which were so very nearly successful, from being crowned with ultimate success. His initial failure, so valuable to himself, seems to have prevented his reelection to the office of general.<sup>1</sup> The credit due to him is enhanced, and his failure to obtain it partly explained by the fact that he conceived as a private citizen the enterprise which brought a favorable peace within Athens' grasp. It was not Demosthenes' fault that she reached too far.

In the spring of 425 the Spartans invaded Attica as usual and began

<sup>1</sup> Another reason has been suggested for Demosthenes' failure to be elected general for the year 426-5. He may not have returned from Acarnania in time for the elections. He was general-elect when he went to Pylos.

to lay waste the land. At the same time a fleet of sixty Peloponnesian ships was sailing for Corcyra to restore the government to the oligarchs. Meanwhile, the Athenians were preparing to send a fleet to Sicily under Eurymedon and Sophocles, with orders to turn aside at Corcyra and protect the democrats. Demosthenes, however, although still a private citizen, obtained permission to make what use he wished of the fleet on its way round the Peloponnese. Thucydides says that he was granted this permission on his own request, but how a private citizen with a stain on his character could obtain such a sweeping commission requires further explanation, and would remain a mystery if the subsequent narrative of Thucydides himself did not supply a clue. The explanation of this, in turn, throws light on the much-vexed question of 'The Luck of Pylos.'

When Eurymedon and Sophocles had reached the promontory of Pylos on their way to Corcyra, Demosthenes asked them to put in and fortify it and leave him with some men to hold it. This, says Thucydides, had been his very purpose in sailing with them. But they refused point blank, on the ground that there were many other deserted rocky headlands on the coast of the Peloponnese that he could seize and fortify at leisure, if he wished to waste his city's resources. From their point of view, and from the fact that they were not gifted with Demosthenes' foresight, their attitude was reasonable. The Peloponnesian fleet had to be removed from Corcyra, and it never occurred to them that this could be done by any other means than by going there themselves and driving it away. If we were influenced by Thucydides' 'Tacitean' innuendo, we should not think that it had occurred to Demosthenes either, but it would be as unjust to assume this as it is ridiculous to assert that the occupation of Pylos came about fortuitously, when Demosthenes had engineered it. It has been suggested that the occupation was due to the foresight of Eurymedon and Sophocles, who left Demosthenes as a bait to lure away the Peloponnesian fleet.<sup>1</sup> Thucydides' narrative may be unjust to Demosthenes, but it does not give the slightest ground for such a suggestion. It is true that there were many other rocky headlands which the Athenians could have seized at any time, and which would have appeared equally

<sup>1</sup> B. W. Henderson, *The Great War between Athens and Sparta*, p. 196. Cf. Thuc., IV, 4.



valueless to the average Athenian, but Demosthenes was the only one who saw the particular advantages that Pylos offered.

While Demosthenes was arguing with his obstinate colleagues, a storm arose and forced them to put in to Pylos against their will. This was the only example of obvious luck that befell during the whole of the enterprise. That it was important must be admitted, but it does not justify Thucydides' attitude toward the subsequent developments; nor does it justify the assumption that, had not the storm arisen, Demosthenes would have been unable to carry out his enterprise at a later date. The fleet, then, was at Pylos, but even so Demosthenes, lacking the authority of office, could not prevail on either generals or men to carry out his suggestions. At last, however, the men themselves, bored by their inactivity, began to fortify the place of their own accord.

When the Spartans first heard that the Athenians were at Pylos, they took no notice, thinking either that they would not stay, or that if they did, the place could be retaken at leisure. But when they discovered that the occupation was seriously intended, they became alarmed and sent off hurried messages to Agis in Attica and to their fleet at Corcyra. When Agis learned that Pylos had been taken, he immediately saw that the situation was dangerous and hurriedly retreated. The Peloponnesian fleet also immediately withdrew from Corcyra, eluding Sophocles and Eurymedon by dragging the ships over the isthmus of Leucas. Thus the two alarms which were causing the Athenians most uneasiness at the time were dissipated at one blow. So early did the results of Demosthenes' foresight begin to show themselves. But he was in an unenviable position. He had with him only five ships and their crews, while the Spartans were preparing to attack him by land and sea with all their forces. He accordingly sent off two of his ships to try to elude the Peloponnesian fleet and induce Eurymedon to return to his relief. With his remaining forces he prepared to hold out as best he could. The common seamen were armed with weapons taken from a Messenian privateer which happened, quite by chance, according to Thucydides, to put in with a cargo of them. This same ship also supplied a contingent of forty extra hoplites. The improbability of this coincidence has been noticed elsewhere, and no argument is needed to dispense with it. This lucky windfall had obviously been prepared beforehand by Demosthenes.

In his account of the peace negotiations which followed the Spartan defeat and the marooning of their men on Sphacteria, Thucydides goes out of his way to bring out the overbearing unreasonableness of the radical party at Athens. The terms of the truce at Pylos were harsh, but the terms of peace that Cleon induced the assembly to demand were harsher still. In rejecting the Spartan offer of peace, the Athenians assumed that they could lay their hands on the men on Sphacteria whenever they wanted, and that by delay they would increase their chance of being able to impose their own terms. In fact it turned out otherwise. The blockade proved tedious and more difficult than they had expected. The blockaders were in greater distress than the blockaded. As time wore on, there is no wonder that they began to be despondent and to wish that they had made peace when it was offered. They quite naturally laid the blame for their discomfiture on Cleon. The latter was in an unenviable position, for the rejection of the peace had been entirely due to him, and now there was the danger that winter would arrive before Sphacteria had been taken; in which case the ships would be forced off the sea and the Spartans would escape. If this happened, no further overtures could be expected from Sparta. In this situation Thucydides represents Cleon as blustering as usual and inveighing against the messengers on the ground that their account was untrue.

The scene which followed in the assembly is one of the most famous and most puzzling in the whole of Thucydides' narrative. The points that are emphasized are, first, Cleon's arrogant bluster, secondly, his apparent cowardice and discomfiture when he finds himself taken at his word, and lastly, his bold confidence when he sees that there is no way of escape. The really important points are those of which the significance is not emphasized. Cleon, an inexperienced man, is given a free hand over the heads of the elected generals of the state. For the fulfilment of what Thucydides regards as an extravagant promise, he asks for nothing but a force of non-citizen peltasts and archers. One is left with the impression that the assembly is a congregation of fools.

The Athenian assembly seems to have had more faith in Cleon than he had in himself, for when he had got what he asked for and had reached Pylos, he was wise enough to subordinate himself to Demosthenes. Thucydides takes care not to stress his wisdom. Just before

he arrived, says Thucydides, another lucky accident had happened. Hitherto, Demosthenes had been afraid to attack the Spartans on Sphacteria because the island was densely wooded, and he had already discovered in Aetolia what could happen to an attacking force in a dense country better known to the enemy. He had been unable to observe either the exact strength of the Spartans or the positions they had taken up; but this difficulty was now removed, for one of his soldiers on a landing party had, quite accidentally, set fire to the undergrowth, and since the wind, again quite accidentally, had happened to be favorable, the whole wood had been burned down. When a man with a grain of sense is faced with a difficulty, he tries to remove it. One way of removing a wood is to burn it down. The soldier who accidentally set fire to the wood on Sphacteria was undoubtedly acting under Demosthenes' orders, and he naturally waited till the wind was blowing in the right direction. Thucydides must have known this as well as anyone.

The attack succeeded chiefly through the agency of the light-armed and peltasts. The retreat of the Spartan hoplites through clouds of dust and ashes and over rough ground was harassed at every step by the irritating attacks of agile enemies with whom they could not come to grips. The Athenian hoplites took scarcely any part, but the peltasts and archers grew bolder and bolder as they discovered that Spartan invincibility was a myth, and that they could attack almost with impunity. It was a repetition of Demosthenes' own Aetolian retreat. He had learned his lesson well. The surprise throughout Greece that Spartans could be forced to surrender while they had arms in their hands was increased by the fact that their discomfiture had been brought about by light-armed. Demosthenes had smashed Spartan prestige, and Cleon had fulfilled his mad promise; or rather, Demosthenes had fulfilled it for him. The result was another offer of peace, which the Athenians again proceeded to throw away. But Attica was henceforward freed from invasion, and Pylos long remained a center of pillage.

In reading through Thucydides' account of the episode, one cannot help being struck by the pains he takes to depreciate the whole enterprise. One thing he is forced to admit: Demosthenes formed the idea and Demosthenes carried it out. But having admitted this, he ap-



parently forgets all about his admission and proceeds to attribute the whole affair, both by direct statement and by implication, to stupendous luck. He credits Demosthenes with no motive and no organization at all. A man does not formulate such a scheme without an ulterior object, nor does he fail to organize the means of carrying it out. It is true that Demosthenes could not foresee that his enterprise would lead to the death or capture of nearly four hundred Spartans, but he could, and probably did, foresee that the occupation of Pylos would be such a thorn in Sparta's side that the Peloponnesian interests would be so undermined by raids and desertion and her movements so hampered that, unless she could recover the place by force, she would be driven to ask for peace. The immediate recall of Sparta's army from Attica and of her fleet from Corcyra shows that he was justified. The added luck of the capture of the men on Sphacteria merely hastened the result. Why, then, is Thucydides unwilling to give Demosthenes the credit he deserved? The Athenians gave most of the credit for the final success to Cleon, and it was he who became the man of the hour. It is admitted that Thucydides is bitter against Cleon and strives, not without success, to represent him as a lucky fool.

For the explanation of his attitude it is necessary to go back to the inception of the enterprise. Demosthenes had not long returned from his successes in the west, but he was still under a cloud as the result of his previous disaster. He was, moreover, of a comparatively obscure family, and possessed no political following like that enjoyed by the aristocratic families to which Pericles, Nicias, and Alcibiades belonged. Accordingly, if he wished to succeed and become a leader of the assembly, he must do so by his own wits and ready tongue, as Themistocles and Cleon had done. Failing this, and since his reputation as a man of action was not only not yet established, but damaged at the outset, it was impossible for him to force through an apparently useless scheme by the weight of his own authority. What he needed was a political ally who was intelligent enough to be made to see the value of the idea, bold enough to take a risk, and influential enough to get what he wanted from the assembly. There is only one man who fits in with these requirements, and to him the evidence clearly points. It was Cleon who got Demosthenes the permission to use the fleet round the Peloponnese; it was Cleon who was Demosthenes' political string-

puller; it was to Cleon that Demosthenes confided the means whereby the Spartans on Sphacteria might be taken. How had Cleon, a middle-class leather-merchant, sufficient military experience to know the efficacy of archers and light-armed troops against hoplites, when even the experienced, but wooden-headed, Nicias had not discovered it? The brazen boldness of Cleon in the assembly, which Thucydides holds up to scorn, is at once explained. He was not the braggart fool that Thucydides implies. He may have been violent, but his bluster on this occasion was a clever piece of cajolery staged to get Nicias and his unimaginative colleagues out of the way. It was the only method by which such an unheard-of resignation of command could be brought about. The conservatives laughed at Cleon's apparent discomfiture, but the laugh was against themselves. Demosthenes, having acquired the light-armed troops he had wanted, fulfilled Cleon's promise for him. Cleon got the credit and put his enemies to shame. This was the price that Demosthenes had to pay for his political alliance. The more intelligent Athenians were fully aware that the real credit belonged to Demosthenes. Even Aristophanes makes a point of it in the *Knights*, where Cleon is accused of filching away the nice Pylos cake that Demosthenes had baked for Demos, and of serving it up to the old gentleman as his own. The question at once arises, why did not Thucydides, if he wished merely to discredit Cleon, follow the same line of argument? He would have been stating no more than the truth if he had shown quite clearly, by merely marshalling his facts in line instead of in column, that Demosthenes deserves the credit for the whole affair. As it is, he gives the true facts in such a way that they obscure one another, so that only those episodes which can possibly be construed as due to luck stand out from the line. Part of the reason may be that Aristophanes, although his jokes often hit the nail on the head, was meant to be laughed at and not taken seriously. If Thucydides had taken the same point of view, he would have risked the inevitable comparison and would have appeared unconvincing. It would have been like taking a political cartoon in *Punch* and making it the theme of a leading article in the *Times*. But the reason for Thucydides' attitude goes far deeper than a petty consideration like this. His hatred of Cleon was undoubtedly far more than a personal one. It was a hatred of mob government and of the race of demagogues as a whole,

who were led by the passion and excitement of the moment to throw away the prosperity of Athens and to keep the whole of Greece embroiled in a devastating war. Demosthenes, in Thucydides' eyes, was one of them. He was the life and soul of the go-ahead radical policy. He was in alliance with Cleon and was the military expert of the democratic party. This was enough for Thucydides, whose whole narrative is intended to show the madness of the exaggerated democracy which followed Pericles. Whether his depreciation of Pylos and Demosthenes was intentional, or whether it was mostly due to personal animosity against Cleon, will never be known. Demosthenes does not come off quite so badly in the enterprises in which Cleon was not concerned, but he shares the implied disapproval which Thucydides felt for what he considered a wrong-headed and heretical policy.

Demosthenes had secured sufficient recognition in the eyes of the Athenians to ensure his reëlection as general for the year 424. He seems to have been the leading spirit in the two major military operations of this year, one of which was partially successful, the other a complete failure. After the seizure of the long walls of Megara and the capture of Nisaea, his star was in the ascendant and he was at last in a position to put into operation his pet Boeotian scheme. This was no less than to plan to bring about a revolution in the Boeotian cities, and to bring over Boeotia to the Athenian alliance. Boeotia was to be attacked from three sides at once, so that Thebes would be unable to concentrate her forces for the defense. These three attacks were to take place on the same day. It was a very well-laid scheme, but unfortunately the length of time required for preparation was so great as to allow too many opportunities for news to leak out. In addition to this, ancient means of communication were not efficient, nor was the war-office of an ancient city-state sufficiently organized to allow the accurate carrying out of such a complicated manoeuvre. There was not a large enough margin of error. Demosthenes was ahead of his times: his imagination outran the means at his command. Not only was the scheme betrayed by a Phocian, but Demosthenes made a mistake in the date and attacked too early. The Thebans also had taken precautions to prevent the rising at Chaeronea, so that when Hippocrates finally invaded Boeotia, their whole force was free to oppose him. The Athenians had seized and fortified Delium and were on their way



home when the Boeotian forces came up behind them. They were forced to form their line in haste and were utterly defeated. The remnant of the fugitives escaped to Athens by sea.

The result of this disaster was that the war-party at Athens was again utterly discredited. All the advantages that Athens had gained in 425 and 424 were more than counterbalanced by this defeat and by the successes that Brasidas had been gaining in Thrace. The Spartans had now something to trade for Pylos and the Sphacterian prisoners; Nicias and the peace party were in power again in Athens. The result was the truce of 423 B.C. Demosthenes, having been the originator of the Boeotian scheme, was out of favour again. He seems to have retired into private life, for we hear no more of him for nine years, except that he was one of those who swore to the terms of the Spartan alliance in 421.

Demosthenes has been severely criticized for his energetic land policy. Thucydides' disapproval is implicit, that of modern historians is open. It has been pointed out that Athens had been taught by the battle of Coronea, in 447 B.C., that she was only squandering her resources in attempting to acquire a land empire, and that she could not have held Boeotia if she had won it. Athens' strength lay on the sea, that of her enemies on the land: accordingly, Pericles' policy had been to resign the land, including even Attica, to the Peloponnesians, to keep a firm hold on the maritime empire of Athens, and to confine his aggression to making attacks on the maritime and coast possessions of the enemy. This policy of passive resistance, however, entailed hardship and endurance and was incapable of winning a decisive result. The most that could be expected from it was that the enemy would tire first and offer peace on equal terms. It was a policy which admitted that Athens was weaker than her enemies. It meant that Athens' army would become demoralized and come to regard itself as no match for the enemy; the timidity of the Athenian hoplites on Sphacteria in the face of less than half their number is sufficient to prove this. Such a policy is only good when there is no other possible. Demosthenes and the radical party were of a different opinion. They believed that the war could only be won by hitting the enemy hard and often. There is only one way by which an inferior power can win battles against an enemy who has superior numbers, and Demosthenes

discovered it, that is, by concentrating forces at a given time and in a given place where the enemy will be for the moment inferior. The effectiveness of manoeuvres of this kind is amply illustrated by the campaigns of Frederick the Great and of Napoleon. Unfortunately Demosthenes failed. In order to concentrate, he had first to divide, and the forces at his command were not trained for such delicate manoeuvres. Under these conditions 'divide and conquer' meant 'divide and be conquered.' Judged in the light of defeat, the whole policy has been declared wrong, but it is quite unfair to assume that this particular enterprise would have been equally valueless if it had succeeded. Athens did not need to hold Boeotia; the democratic parties in the cities would have held it for her. All that Demosthenes needed to do was to win a battle, or at any rate to appear with forces enough to encourage the discontented democratic element to seize control. There was nothing at all impracticable in the idea. If it had succeeded, Thebes would have been helpless in the face of a disunited Boeotia. She would have concentrated her energies in reuniting it, and her magnificent hoplite force would have ceased to be at the disposal of the Peloponnesians. The issue of the war might have been totally changed, especially when we remember that it was a Boeotian expeditionary force which broke the last Athenian attack on Syracuse. But Demosthenes' reputation does not depend on whether, from the point of view of statesmanship, this policy was right or wrong. He was merely the military exponent of the policy. He was a soldier, and as a soldier he must be judged. It was his business to win land battles, and he discovered the only method by which it was possible for Athens to accomplish this.

It was not till 414 B.C. that Athens called for his services again, and on this occasion, one of the most tragic events in history, he lost his life in a heroic attempt to save Athens from the consequences of her own folly.

Demosthenes' career both began and ended with disaster, and this doubtless has not a little to do with the fact that his significance in both the military and political history of Greece has not been appreciated. His capacity as a general, indeed, has been recognized, and is proved by the fact that he never repeated a mistake. Never after his defeat do we find him taken at a disadvantage in unknown country.

Both in his campaign in the west and at Pylos we find him sending men ahead to spy out the country and seize points of vantage. But his capacity to learn went further than this. He had discovered that under certain conditions peltasts were superior to hoplites: and these conditions prevailed over more than four-fifths of the area of Greece. The hoplite was effective only on ground of his own choosing, and this ground consisted of the level valleys surrounding the cities, and formed scarcely a fifth of the total area of the country. Why the hoplite was retained so long under these apparently unfavorable conditions is well brought out by Mr. Grundy in his book on *Thucydides and the History of his Age*. The Greek city-state was poor and had no resources of capital to tide over hard times. The citizens relied on this year's harvest for their subsistence during the coming winter, so that if an enemy appeared in their valley, they must drive him out to save their crops, or face starvation. That is why two armies in heavy armor lined up in a level valley and pushed till one side gave way. But by Demosthenes' time these conditions were beginning to change. A rich state like Athens, which had an external revenue, could afford to adopt other less desperate tactics. It was Demosthenes who showed how these tactics were to develop. The credit for the introduction of peltasts belongs to him, not to Iphicrates. But the light-armed peltast, being capable of much more complicated manoeuvres than the hoplite, required a much more specialized training in order to be effective. The time when this was possible had not yet arrived. Greece was not yet decadent, and the armies which defended a city were still composed of her own citizens, called from the plough or the workshop. They had not the time to devote to military exercises which later made the mercenary soldiers of Iphicrates so effective. It was not till the fourth century, when the economic distress following the exhaustion of the Peloponnesian War had flooded the Mediterranean world with bands of unemployed adventurers, that Demosthenes' idea was seriously taken up. He was in advance of his times, and met with the lack of recognition that always falls to the lot of such men.

His relations with the Athenian government also foreshadow the subsequent political development of the Greek city-state. Hitherto, Athens' leaders in war have also been her leaders in peace, and that is why the ability of her generals was usually so mediocre. Themistocles



and Pisistratus were, perhaps, exceptions. Cimon was a good general, but he was no statesman. Pericles was a consummate statesman, but his military ability was hopelessly average. Demosthenes, on the other hand, was a general of a quite new type. He seems to have had no independent influence in politics at all; consequently, it is only when he is able to secure a political ally that he can carry out with safety ideas of his own; otherwise he is confined to carrying out the orders of others. The party whose orders he carried out, and to which he himself belonged, was the radical party headed by Cleon. The ascendancy of the extreme democrats at this time was entirely due to Demosthenes, for without his military successes to show, they would have been unable to maintain their policy in the face of the opposition of the moderates. Their irresponsible recklessness and ultimate failure brought down on them the wrath of Thucydides. Their absorption in the Boeotian scheme of Demosthenes blinded them to the danger from Brasidas's activities in Thrace. They consequently failed to send Thucydides adequate support; then, when he failed through no fault of his own, they turned on him and rent him in pieces. There is no wonder that Thucydides is bitter against Cleon and Demosthenes. The latter, not having supreme control of his own policy, was not to blame, but in Thucydides' account, which sets out to expose the democratic policy in all its recklessness and futility, he shares the fate of the rest.

But although Demosthenes' importance was limited to military affairs, he reached a higher degree of proficiency in this sphere than anyone before him. He was the first of the professional soldiers, the forerunner of such mercenary captains as Iphicrates, Chares, and Charidemus. After Demosthenes' time the leadership in war tended more and more to become divorced from the leadership in the assembly, until, in fourth-century Athens, it was quite possible for the Athenians to vote an expedition and quite forget to vote the money to pay for it. It was for these reasons that Demosthenes failed to obtain due recognition from his contemporaries. His career was tragic, but perhaps his greatest misfortune was to be belittled by the historian who has had the ear of posterity.

SUMMARIES OF DISSERTATIONS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF PH.D., 1927-28

MAURICE WESTCOTT AVERY. — *De numeris lyricis Graecis qui in  
carminibus quibusdam nuper repertis audiuntur*

IN THIS dissertation I have attempted to explain the metrical construction of some of the Greek lyric poems recently discovered according to the theories now generally accepted by students of Greek metric. As the chief authorities for these theories I have followed in the main John Williams White, Otto Schroeder, and von Wilamowitz, although I have found myself unable to agree with these scholars in many details of varying importance. The material of my investigation has been limited in two ways: in the first place, only those poems have been considered the metrical composition of which either offers something really new or presents difficulties worthy of reconsideration. This limitation has necessarily caused the exclusion of some of the finest of the new poems, especially of those composed in the Alcaic and Sapphic strophes. Secondly, within my first limitation it has seemed advisable to include only poems which have come down to us in a fairly good state of preservation; for many of the papyrus fragments are so badly mutilated that any attempt to represent their metrical form must be wholly conjectural. I have made an exception to this rule, however, in the case of the first two choruses of Sophocles' *Ichneutae*, because their omission would have left this portion of my work incomplete, and also because a reasonable degree of certainty as to their composition seemed attainable.

In the preface I have defined my own position with regard to Greek metric by pointing out the main differences between the so-called new metricians and the older school of Roszbach and Westphal, and by discussing some of the fallacies of that school. There follows an outline of the development of Greek lyric verse, Aeolic and Ionic, from the primitive dimeter and trimeter, which originated among the Aryan ancestors of the historic Greeks. The two kinds of verse are treated sepa-

rately, as they should be, for the primitive forms underwent quite different developments at the hands of the Aeolic and Ionic Greeks.

The first chapter contains my analysis of a number of the new poems of Sappho and Alcaeus. The metres of these poems are for the most part simple, although they display considerable variety, and several interesting new strophic combinations occur. It seems reasonable to infer from our now wider knowledge of the work of the Lesbian poets that their originality in composition consisted more in devising new combinations of verses already familiar than in attempting to add to the rich store of verse forms bequeathed to them. But one type of verse occurs the origin and composition of which is as yet, in my opinion, unexplained; namely, the so-called Aeolic dactyls. By some curious chance the new poems of both Sappho and Alcaeus contain comparatively long specimens of the Aeolic dactylic pentameter, a metre hitherto represented by only a few verses of the Lesbian poets. Schroeder has an ingenious but hardly convincing theory as to the composition of these elusive dactyls, while Wilamowitz refuses to discuss the problem. I have been forced to content myself with the statement that the connection of these metres with the glyconic can hardly be doubted, but whether they developed from the glyconic remains an open question.

In the second chapter I have analyzed most of the new poems of Pindar. The Paeans — and most of the new discoveries belong to this class — present many difficulties hardly inferior to those of the epinician odes. The loss of the music which accompanied these poems is greatly to be regretted, for without it certainty with regard to the metrical constitution of many verses can hardly be attained. I have disagreed often, perhaps too often, with the analyses of the German authorities. Schroeder, despite his very great contributions to the science of Greek metric, seems to me to be rather fanciful and artificial in many of his analyses, while Wilamowitz, who unfortunately has not attempted some of the more difficult poems, frequently disregards, in my opinion, the rhythmical demands of a period, or even of shorter phrases. The two examples of the partheneion which close this chapter are remarkable for the extreme simplicity of their metrical structure.

The choral songs of Sophocles' *Ichneutae* form the material of the final chapter. In view of the badly mutilated condition of the first two choruses it has seemed best to discuss the possibilities of each verse



separately. While the third and fourth choruses are better preserved and less difficult than the others, I have found it necessary to differ from the editors of the play both with regard to the metre and the form of these lyrics.

---

NATALIE MURRAY GIFFORD. — *The Palmette Design in Greek Art*

THE palmette must have been one of the most, if not the most, common decorative form in Greek life. We have it preserved in architecture and sculpture, in vase painting and small bronzes, on coins and at least one gem. The representations on vase painting show that it was a common decoration on armor, dress, and household furnishings. I have endeavored to collect typical examples of palmettes in all the arts and trace their development.

The earliest architectural palmettes had heavy straight-sided petals which radiated from a rounded centre. Only the lowest petals were at all flexible. In the majority of palmettes there were seven petals, but nine and five were not uncommon. The types of decoration were few and obvious. The most common was a combination of volute and palmette. In borders, the palmette was either a very secondary filling ornament, or was arranged stiffly and symmetrically, relieved at times by a lotus flower.

By the second half of the sixth century there was a feeling for greater elaboration and grace. The petals became more flexible. In terra cotta revetments the petals were modelled in relief, and, no doubt because of this modelling, the central petal tended to become pointed. The lotus bud and flower were used more freely than in the earlier decoration, but there was no great innovation in type or form.

The striving for refinement and grace was still more marked in the early years of the fifth century. The petals became more numerous and slender and bent more from the straight line. Due to the modelling of the petals, many palmettes had a pointed central petal with a high central rib. In a few examples, generally where there was a desire for contrast between two superimposed palmettes, the petals were concave in section. The petals were no longer attached to one another in relief or painted designs, but in stone they were still attached to one another for most of their length at least. In the arrangement of the palmettes

there was little difference from the preceding century. In the antefixes there was a growing preference for the palmette alone without the lotus flower. In connected borders, on the contrary, a combination of palmette and lotus was almost general.

Sometime after the middle of the fifth century the acanthus leaf was added to the palmette decoration and there was a growing feeling for naturalism in the treatment of tendrils. Next to the introduction of the acanthus leaf, the most radical innovation towards the end of the fifth century was the incurving of the petals of the palmettes. The outcurving petals also tended to bend mostly at the tips which assumed a hooked appearance. The height of the relief was increased, a fact which led to free-standing palmettes in the fourth century.

There was practically no difference in the palmette ornament of the late fifth and early fourth centuries. In antefixes, the lotus had entirely disappeared and its place was taken by acanthus leaves and elaborate scrolls with frequently branching tendrils. The predominant type of palmette in the fourth century had petals which bend inward in an S curve. This was varied by omitting the central petal and making a cleft palmette. When the petals curved outward, they, also, had a marked S curve and a tendency to breadth at their tips. A third type of petal approached the more natural form of leaf by using a broken curve for its lower side. The petals of the palmettes frequently bent forward from the background of the relief in an attempt to give a third dimension. The three types of petal were used in palmettes in the same border. The lotus flower, rising generally from some form of calyx, tended to become more stylized and to approach the palmette in form. The acanthus leaf was universal, and the tendrils developed into ribbed and jointed stalks, frequently at the expense of the palmette decoration.

The third century carried on the traditions of the fourth with almost no change. The vitality of the palmette as a decorative motive in itself was declining and various devices were used to give life to the design. The introduction of flowers and scrolls, and the variation of the palmette in the same design were all part of the desire for innovations. This tendency was carried to the extreme in the succeeding centuries.

Some of the palmettes that were carved in the Roman period were skilfully and tastefully arranged and can hardly be distinguished from

earlier work, but ordinarily Roman work can be recognized by its carelessness in execution and design, and the almost frantic desire for variety.

The fourth-century cutters of grave stelae developed from the cleft palmette a type to fill the elliptical space that was popular at that time for the acroteria of stelae. This type of palmette was apparently confined to this period and use.

The earliest design that can be called a palmette in vase painting had petals almost circular in outline rising above a broad band between volutes. Somewhat later the early palmettes had broad petals with straight sides and rounded tips just as in architecture. In the eastern Greek world the petals were usually separated; in the western, they were shown only by incision. The incised technique was practically abandoned before the end of the sixth century. Thereafter the petals grew more slender and graceful and the designs more elaborate. Toward the end of the fifth century the palmette with hooked petals appeared on vases. There are interesting parallels between the arrangement of the designs in architecture and in vase painting, close enough to admit the supposition that one must have influenced the other.

The designs on the early bronzes were very similar to those on the early vases, whereas the bronzes made later, when we have architectural and sculptural remains with which to compare them, seem to show parallelisms to the architectural palmette decoration.

---

CHARLES LAWTON SHERMAN. — *Quo modo ingenia moresque personarum  
descripserit Aeschylus*

THE dissertation aims to examine the methods of characterization in Aeschylus and to determine to what extent character is stressed by the poet. The Greeks, whose opinions are voiced in the *Poetics* of Aristotle, considered character-drawing inferior in importance to plot. Modern critics have repeatedly denied to Aeschylus skill in character-drawing, claiming that he presents only typical characters, of the sort called "static," whose finer traits are neglected as a result of the poet's desire to give grandeur and universality to his figures. They have said that Aeschylus uses only the "broader brush strokes" and consequently does not portray characters whose "inner



springs of action" and conduct we may successfully determine. In an attempt to prove or disprove the generally accepted opinion, the present writer takes up in succession the seven extant plays of the poet and analyzes in each of the personages the character-elements and the methods employed in portraying character.

Indications of character are drawn from three sources, the actions of a dramatic personage, his own words regarding himself, and the judgments of other personages concerning him. By an analysis of these three sources, we may arrive at definite conclusions bearing on the extent of character portrayal. Such an analysis is carried out in the body of this dissertation, and the attempt is made to develop, so far as can safely be done, the indications and hints of character let fall by the poet, into the complete picture which the poet had formed of the characters in his own mind. Only on the basis of evidence of this nature can we decide on the extent and adequacy of the characterization. Coincident with the analysis of traits of character is the determination of the methods employed by the poet, such as contrast of characters, tests of will, and the less evident devices of diction, metre, and the use of the "little word" which throws into sudden and sharp relief a trait or a quality so subtle that it risks being lost in the more imposing whole.

The result of this investigation shows clearly the gradual nature of the poet's development. Indications of character abound even in the earliest play, the *Suppliant Maidens*, but it is not until the *Seven* is reached that a real tragic hero is evolved. With the *Oresteia* the poet shows his ability not only to portray the protagonist but to give him strong support by a well-drawn cast. If the *Furies* seems to refute this statement, it is only because the poet in this play has distinctly other aims which do not admit of careful delineation of character. The present writer regards this as the only play which would bear out the usual assertion that Aeschylus' personages are types only. It thus affords an excellent example by way of contrast. For throughout all of the other plays abundant evidence is at hand to prove subtle and painstaking delineation of character beyond that which might be considered barely necessary to the action of the drama. It is possible, therefore, to assert as a general rule that the poet conceived his personages as individuals and not as types; that they are not drawn simply in their

larger aspects, but that there is a subtlety of delineation which proves the poet a master in this phase of his art.

It is not possible to prove that Aeschylus considers character-drawing of first importance as modern playwrights often do. The ancient poet is more concerned with the religious and universal human principles that his dramas portray. While he does not go to the extent of evolving plot from character as regularly as Sophocles does, not a few of his plays, even the earliest, show the action constantly guided by a clearly defined will of the protagonist. In many cases Aeschylus uses the devices that Sophocles made into definite forms of art, such as climactic order of tests for the will of the protagonist, or the introduction of the chorus or a secondary character as a foil. There is nothing set or stereotyped in the use of such devices; the variety of method here precludes definite classification.

The art of Aeschylus can best be compared to the art of Homer in the matter of character-drawing. Recent writers have dispelled the illusion that Homer portrayed only the type. The epics show the more minute lines of characterization which make necessary the hypothesis of a definite conception of individual characters in the mind of the poet. With Homer the narrative, with Aeschylus the action or the religious teaching is more important, but both poets by definite and precise methods present us the nicer and subtler traits of their personages.





## GENERAL INDEX

- Achæans, 73, 74, 76, 90.  
 Alexander, 12 ff.  
 ANDERSON, ANDREW RUNNI, *see* Heracles.  
 Antony, 42 ff.  
 Archeology and Classical Tradition, 91.  
 Argives, 73.  
 Augustus, 44 ff.  
 AVERY, MAURICE WESTCOTT, *De numeris lyricis Graecis qui in carminibus quibusdam nuper repertis audiuntur*, 109-111.  
 Cadmus, 80.  
 Caesar, 39 ff.  
 Cecrops, 80.  
 Cleon, 93, 94, 100, 102, 103.  
 Danaoi, The, by Leicester B. Holland, 59-92.  
 Danaoi, 73, 74, 76, 81, 85.  
 Deinolochus, 4.  
 Demosthenes, Son of Alcisthenes, by Eric Charles Woodcock, 93-108.  
 Dorians, 63 ff., 92.  
 Egypt, 79, 81 ff.  
 GIFFORD, NATALIE MURRAY, The Palmette Design in Greek Art, 111-113.  
 Heracles and his Successors. A Study of a Heroic Ideal and the Recurrence of a Heroic Type, by Andrew Runni Anderson, 7-58.  
 Heracles, 8 ff.  
 Heracles-Alexander in the Alexander Romance, 19 ff.  
 HOLLAND, LEICESTER B., The Danaoi, 59-92.  
*incrementum*, 51.  
 -κτ- to -ττ-, 6.  
 Migrations and Invasions into Greece, 65, 66, 88, 90, 91.  
 Minyan-ware, 65.  
 Oceanus and the Cosmic Serpent, 45 ff.  
 ὀλβεττήρ, 4.  
 On a New Fragment of Dorian Farce, by Joshua Whatmough, 1-6.  
 Pelasgians, 73, 75.  
 Perset (Palusati), Zeker (Tchakaray), Denyen, etc., 82 ff.  
 Pompey, 37 ff.  
 Pylos, 98.  
 Romulus, 29 ff.  
 Scipio Africanus, 31 ff.  
 SHERMAN, CHARLES LAWTON, *Quo modo ingenia moresque personarum descripserit Aeschylus*, 113-115.  
 Thucydides  
     and Cleon, 93, 94.  
     and Demosthenes, 103-105.  
 τραγοιδός, 2.  
 Trade-routes, 66, 90.  
 WHATMOUGH, JOSHUA, On a New Fragment of Dorian Farce, 1-6.  
 WOODCOCK, ERIC CHARLES, Demosthenes, Son of Alcisthenes, 93-108.



# HARVARD STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Edited by a Committee of the Classical Instructors of  
Harvard University.

PUBLISHED BY THE HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

---

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME I, 1890.

- The Fauces of the Roman House. — *By James B. Greenough.*  
De Ignis Eliciendi Modis apud Antiquos. — *Scriptis Morris H. Morgan.*  
On the Origin of the Construction of οὐ μή with the Subjunctive and the Future Indicative. — *By William W. Goodwin.*  
On Some Disputed Points in the Construction of εἴδει, χρῆν, etc., with the Infinitive. — *By William W. Goodwin.*  
Notes on Quintilian. — *By George M. Lane.*  
Some Latin Etymologies. — *By James B. Greenough.*  
On *egregium publicum* (Tac. Ann. 3, 70, 4). — *By Clement L. Smith.*  
On the Use of the Perfect Infinitive in Latin with the Force of the Present. — *By Albert A. Howard.*  
Plutarch περὶ εὐθυίας. — *By Harold N. Fowler.*  
Vitruviana. — *By George M. Richardson.*  
The Social and Domestic Position of Women in Aristophanes. — *By Herman W. Hayley.*  
Notes. Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME II, 1891.

- Quaestiones Petronianae. — *Scriptis Herman W. Hayley.*  
Greek and Roman Barbers. — *By F. W. Nicolson.*  
Some Constructions in Andocides. — *By Morris H. Morgan.*  
Gajus or Gaius? — *By Frederic D. Allen.*  
An Inscribed Kotylos from Boeotia. — *By John C. Rolfe.*  
*Nedum.* — *By J. W. H. Walden.*  
Some Uses of *Neque (Nec)* in Latin. — *By James B. Greenough.*  
The Participial Construction with *πυργάζειν* and *κυρεῖν*. — *By J. R. Wheeler.*  
The 'Stage' in Aristophanes. — *By J. W. White.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME III, 1892.

- The Date of Cylon. — *By John Henry Wright.*  
Catullus and the Phaselus of his Fourth Poem. — *By Clement L. Smith.*  
On the Homeric Caesura and the Close of the Verse as related to the Expression of Thought. — *By Thomas D. Seymour.*  
On the Notion of Virtue in the Dialogues of Plato, with particular reference to those of the First Period and to the Third and Fourth Books of the Republic. — *By William A. Hammond.*  
Notes. Indexes.



## CONTENTS OF VOLUME IV, 1893.

- The *Αὔλος* or Tibia. — *By Albert A. Howard.*  
 The Tragedy Rhesus. — *By John C. Rolfe.*  
 The Use of *Hercle* (*Mehercle*), *Edepol* (*Pol*), *Ecastor* (*Mecastor*), by Plautus and Terence. — *By Frank W. Nicolson.*  
 Accentual Rhythm in Latin. — *By James B. Greenough.*  
 On the Omission of the Subject-Accusative of the Infinitive in Ovid. — *By Richard C. Manning.*  
 Latin Etymologies. — *By James B. Greenough.*  
 On *πεῖραρ ἐλέσθαι* (Σ 501) and the *Manus Consertio* of the Romans. — *By Frederic D. Allen.*  
*Herondaea*. — *By John Henry Wright.*  
 Notes. Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME V, 1894.

- Stage-Terms in Heliodorus's *Aethiopica*. — *By J. W. H. Walden.*  
 Notes on the Bacchae of Euripides. — *By Mortimer Lamson Earle.*  
 Notes on Lysias. — *By Morris H. Morgan.*  
 Early Latin Prosody. — *By James B. Greenough.*  
 The *κότταβος κατακτός* in the Light of Recent Investigations. — *By Herman W. Hayley.*  
 De Scholiis Aristophaneis Quaestiones Mythicae. — *Scriptit Carolus Burton Gulick.*  
*H* as a Mute in Latin. — *By E. S. Sheldon.*  
 Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME VI, 1895.

- The Opisthodomus on the Acropolis at Athens. — *By John Williams White. With Plate.*  
 Artemis Anaktis and Mên Tiamu, A Votive Tablet in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. — *By John Henry Wright. With Plate.*  
 The Date of Lycophron. — *By William N. Bates.*  
 Quo modo *Iaciendi Verbi Composita* in *Praesentibus Temporibus Enuntiaverint Antiqui et Scripserint*. — *Quaerit Mauricius W. Mather.*  
 Homeric Quotations in Plato and Aristotle. — *By George Edwin Howes.*  
 Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME VII, 1896.

- The articles in this volume are contributed by former pupils and colleagues of Professor George Martin Lane, in commemoration of the happy completion of fifty years since he received his first degree in Arts from Harvard College.*  
 On the Extent of the Deliberative Construction in Relative Clauses in Greek. — *By William W. Goodwin.*  
 Some Features of the Contrary to Fact Construction. — *By James B. Greenough.*  
 Studies in the Text of Lucretius. — *By William Everett.*  
 On '*Os Columnatum*' (Plaut. *M. G.* 211) and Ancient Instruments of Confinement. — *By Frederic D. Allen.*  
 Cicero's Journey into Exile. — *By Clement Lawrence Smith.*  
 Five Interesting Greek Imperatives. — *By John Henry Wright.*  
 The Plot of the Agamemnon. — *By Louis Dyer.*  
 Musonius the Etruscan. — *By Charles Pomeroy Parker.*  
 Notes on the Anapaests of Aischylos. — *By Herbert Weir Smyth.*  
 The Dates of the Exiles of Peisistratos. — *By Harold N. Fowler.*  
 Coronelli's Maps of Athens. — *By J. R. Wheeler. With Plate.*  
 Notes on Persius. — *By Morris H. Morgan.*  
 Notes on Suetonius. — *By Albert A. Howard.*  
*Varia Critica*. — *By Herman W. Hayley.*  
 A Point of Order in Greek and Latin. — *By J. W. H. Walden.*  
 Omens and Augury in Plautus. — *By Charles Burton Gulick.*  
 Syllabification in Roman Speech. — *By William Gardner Hale.*  
 Indexes.



## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XI (continued).

- Notes on the Worship of the Roman Emperors in Spain. — *By George Converse Fiske.*  
*Συγγενής Ὀφθαλμός.* — *By Josiah Bridge.*  
Ancient Roman Curb Bits. — *By Robert Emmons Lee.*  
Notes on the Phormio. — *By H. W. Hayley.*  
Epigraphica. — *By Minton Warren.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XII, 1901.

- The articles in this volume are contributed by former pupils and colleagues of Professor William Watson Goodwin, in commemoration of the happy completion of fifty years since he received his first degree in Arts from Harvard College, and of forty-one years since he became Eliot Professor.*
- On Ellipsis in some Latin Constructions. — *By J. B. Greenough.*  
Catullus *vs.* Horace. — *By William Everett.*  
A Preliminary Study of certain Manuscripts of Suetonius' Lives of the Caesars. — *By Clement Lawrence Smith.*  
Iambic Composition of Sophocles. — *By Isaac Flagg.*  
Tzetzes's Notes on the *Aves* of Aristophanes in Codex Urbinas 141. — *By John Williams White.*  
The Origin of Subjunctive and Optative Conditions in Greek and Latin. — *By Wm. Gardner Hale.*  
Unpublished Scholia from the Vaticanus (C) of Terence. — *By Minton Warren.*  
Studies in Sophocles. — *By John Henry Wright.*  
Plato as a Playwright. — *By Louis Dyer.*  
Lucianea. — *By Francis G. Allinson.*  
Musonius in Clement. — *By Charles Pomeroy Parker.*  
Plato, Lucretius, and Epicurus. — *By Paul Shorey.*  
The Origin of the Statements contained in Plutarch's Life of Pericles, Chapter XIII. — *By Harold N. Fowler.*  
Notes on the so-called Capuchin Plans of Athens. — *By J. R. Wheeler.*  
Miscellanea. — *By Morris H. Morgan.*  
The Preposition *Ab* in Horace. — *By John C. Rolfe.*  
Notes on a Fifteenth Century Manuscript of Suetonius. — *By Albert A. Howard.*  
The Antigone of Euripides. — *By James M. Paton.*  
The Use of *μή* with the Participle where the Negative is Influenced by the Construction upon which the Participle Depends. — *By George Edwin Howes.*  
Notes on the Tragic Hypotheses. — *By Clifford Herschel Moore.*  
An Observation on the Style of S. Luke. — *By James Hardy Ropes.*  
The Use of *μή* in Questions. — *By Frank Cole Babbitt.*  
Notes on the Old Temple of Athena on the Acropolis. — *By William Nickerson Bates.*  
On the Greek Infinitive after Verbs of Fearing. — *By Charles Burton Gulick.*  
Argos, Io, and the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus. — *By Joseph Clark Hoppin.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIII, 1902.

- The Politics of the Patrician Claudii. — *By George Converse Fiske.*  
The Shield Devices of the Greeks. — *By George Henry Chase.*  
A Study of the Danaid Myth. — *By Campbell Bonner.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIV, 1903.

- This volume is dedicated to the memory of Professor James Bradstreet Greenough, through whose efforts the publication fund was secured, and to whom, in large measure, the success of the Studies is due.*
- James Bradstreet Greenough (with Portrait). — *By George Lyman Kittredge.*  
Observations on the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil. — *By W. Warde Fowler.*  
The Illustrated Terence Manuscripts. — *By Karl E. Weston.*  
The Relation of the Scene-Headings to the Miniatures in Manuscripts of Terence. — *By John Calvin Watson.*  
Indexes. Plates.



## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XV, 1904.

- On the Composition of Boethius' *Consolatio Philosophiae*. — *By Edward Kennard Rand.*  
Notes on some Uses of Bells among the Greeks and Romans. — *By Arthur Stanley Pease.*  
The Nemesis of the Younger Cratinus. — *By Edward Capps.*  
Some Phases of the Cult of the Nymphs. — *By Floyd G. Ballentine.*  
*De Comicis Graecis Litterarum Iudicibus*. — *Quaesivit Guilielmus Wilson Baker.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVI, 1905.

- A Preliminary Study of Certain Manuscripts of Suetonius' Lives of the Caesars: Second Paper. — *By Clement Lawrence Smith.*  
The Dramatic Art of Aeschylus. — *By Chandler R. Post.*  
An Examination of the Theories Regarding the Nature and Origin of Indo-European Inflection. — *By Hanns Oertel and Edward P. Morris.*  
The Use of the High-Soled Shoe or Buskin in Greek Tragedy of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C. — *By Kendall K. Smith.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVII, 1906.

*The articles in this volume are contributed by instructors in the Department of the Classics as a token of affection and esteem for Clement Lawrence Smith, of the class of 1863, for thirty-four years a valued member of the Department, but forced by ill health to resign the Pope Professorship of Latin in this University in 1904.*

- Notes on Vitruvius. — *By Morris H. Morgan*  
Catullus and the Augustans. — *By Edward Kennard Rand.*  
On Five New Manuscripts of the Commentary of Donatus to Terence. — *By Minton Warren.*  
On the Origin of the Taurobolium. — *By Clifford Herschel Moore.*  
Aspects of Greek Conservatism. — *By Herbert Weir Smyth.*  
The Battle of Salamis. — *By William W. Goodwin.*  
An Unrecognized Actor in Greek Comedy. — *By John Williams White.*  
The Origin of Plato's Cave. — *By John Henry Wright.*  
An Amphora with a New *Kalós*-Name in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. — *By George Henry Chase.*  
Sacer intra Nos Spiritus. — *By Charles Pomeroy Parker.*  
Valerius Antias and Livy. — *By Albert A. Howard.*  
Indexes. Plates.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVIII, 1907.

- 'Logaoedic' Metre in Greek Comedy. — *By John Williams White.*  
The Medea of Seneca. — *By Harold Loomis Cleasby.*  
Boyhood and Youth in the Days of Aristophanes. — *By Arthur Alexis Bryant.*  
Stylistic Tests and the Chronology of the Works of Boethius. — *By Arthur Patch McKinlay.*  
The Manuscript Tradition of the *Acharnenses*. — *By Earnest Cary.*  
Note on the Battle of Pharsalus. — *By Arthur Searle.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIX, 1908.

- The Olympian Council House and Council. — *By Louis Dyer.*  
The Propitiation of Zeus. — *By Joseph William Hewitt.*  
The Authorship and the Date of the Double Letters in Ovid's *Heroides*. — *By Sereno Burton Clark.*  
The Use of ἀλιτήριος, ἀλιτρός, ἀραῖος, ἐναγής, ἐνθύμιος, παλαμναῖος, and προστρόπαιος: A Study in Greek Lexicography. — *By William Henry Paine Hatch.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XX, 1909.

- Latin Inscriptions in the Harvard Collection of Classical Antiquities. — *By Clifford H. Moore.*  
Classical Elements in Browning's *Aristophanes' Apology*. — *By Carl Newell Jackson.*  
A List of Text-Books from the Close of the Twelfth Century. — *By Charles H. Haskins.*  
The Development of Motion in Archaic Greek Sculpture. — *By Chandler Rathfon Post.*  
An Emendation of Vitruvius. — *By C. A. R. Sanborn.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXI, 1910.

- Critical and Explanatory Notes on Vitruvius. — *By Morris H. Morgan.*  
Magistri Scriniarum, ἀντιγραφῆς, and ρεφερενδάριοι. — *By J. B. Bury.*  
Three *Puer*-Scenes in Plautus, and the Distribution of Rôles. — *By Henry W. Prescott*  
A Harvard Manuscript of St. Augustine. — *By Arthur Stanley Pease.*  
The Sicilian Translators of the Twelfth Century and the First Latin Version of Ptolemy's *Almagest*. — *By Charles H. Haskins and Dean Putnam Lockwood.*  
On a Passage in Pindar's Fourth Nemean Ode. — *By Charles E. Whitmore.*  
The *Oresteia* of Aeschylus as Illustrated by Greek Vase-Painting. — *By Hetty Goldman.*  
Doctors of Philosophy in Classical Philology and Classical Archaeology of Harvard University.  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXII, 1911.

- Lucretiana: Notes on Books I and II of the *De Rerum Natura*. — *By J. S. Reid.*  
An Attempt to Restore the γ Archetype of Terence Manuscripts. — *By Robert Henning Webb.*  
Antecedents of Greek Corpuscular Theories. — *By William Arthur Heidel.*  
The ὑποῶματα of Greek Ships. — *By Edward G. Schaubert.*  
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1910-11:  
    Quibus virtutum vitiorumque moralium exemplis ex suorum annalibus sumptis scriptores Latini antiqui uti sint. — *By Henry Wheatland Litchfield.*  
    Quibus temporibus religiones ab Oriente ortae et Romae et in provinciis Romanis floruerint desierintque quaestiones. — *By Dwight Nelson Robinson.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXIII, 1912.

- Some Features of the Allegorical Debate in Greek Literature. — *By Margaret Coleman Waites.*  
A Manuscript of Jerome's *De Viris Illustribus* belonging to the General Theological Seminary in New York. — *By William Henry Paine Hatch.*  
The Dramatic Art of Sophocles. — *By Chandler Rathfon Post.*  
The Attic Alphabet in Thucydides: A Note on Thucydides, 8, 9, 2. — *By Henry Wheatland Litchfield.*  
Further Notes on Sicilian Translations of the Twelfth Century. — *By Charles Homer Haskins.*  
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1911-12:  
    De Libris Aliquot Suetonianis. — *By Francis Howard Fobes.*  
    De Ovidi Carminum Amatoriorum textus historia quaeritur. — *By Walter Houghton Freeman.*  
    De Vaticiniis apud Poetas Graecos. — *By Roy Merle Peterson.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXIV, 1913.

- Lucilius: The *Ars Poetica* of Horace, and Persius. — *By George Converse Fiske.*  
The Latin Epyllion. — *By Carl Newell Jackson.*  
De Rinucio Aretino Graecarum Litterarum Interprete. — *Scriptisit Dean P. Lockwood.*  
The Dramatic Art of Menander. — *By Chandler Rathfon Post.*  
Cicero's Judgment on Lucretius. — *By Henry Wheatland Litchfield.*  
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1912-13:  
    Quomodo Pictores Vasorum Graecorum Facta Herculis illustraverint quaeritur. —  
    *By Stephen Bleecker Luce, Jr.*  
    De Motibus Animi apud Poetas Epicos Homerum Apolloniumque expressis. — *By*  
    *Carroll H. May.*  
    Quid de somniis censuerint quoque modo eis usi sint antiqui quaeritur. — *By*  
    *Samuel Hart Newhall.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXV, 1914.

- National Exempla Virtutis in Roman Literature. — *By Henry Wheatland Litchfield.*  
Medical Allusions in the Works of St. Jerome. — *By Arthur Stanley Pease.*  
Mediaeval Versions of the Posterior Analytics. — *By Charles Homer Haskins.*  
The Law of the Hendecasyllable. — *By Roy Kenneth Hack.*  
Molle atque Facetum. — *By Carl Newell Jackson.*  
Hippocratea, I. — *By William Arthur Heidel.*  
Summary of Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., 1913-14:  
    De Praepositionis *Sub* Usu. — *By Henry T. Schnittkind.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXVI, 1915.

- Quo Modo Aristophanes Rem Temporalem in Fabulis Suis Tractaverit. — *Quaesivit*  
*Otis Johnson Todd.*  
The Roman Magistri in the Civil and Military Service of the Empire. — *By Arthur*  
*Edward Romilly Boak.*  
Notes on the Fourth and Fifth Centuries. — *By George W. Robinson.*  
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1914-15:  
    De Choro Euripideo. — *By Aristides Evangelus Phoutrides.*  
    De Scripturae Hibernicae Fontibus. — *By William Frank Wyatt.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXVII, 1916.

- The Doctrine of Literary Forms. — *By Roy Kenneth Hack.*  
The Historical Socrates in the Light of Professor Burnet's Hypothesis. — *By Charles*  
*Pomeroy Parker.*  
The Chorus of Euripides. — *By Aristides Evangelus Phoutrides.*  
Summary of Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., 1915-16:  
    Quo Modo Claudius Claudianus praeceptis rhetoricis in Laudationibus scribendis-  
    usus sit quaeritur. — *By Lester Burton Struthers.*  
Indexes.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXVIII, 1917.

- On the Second Book of Aristotle's Poetics and the Source of Theophrastus' Defini-  
tion of Tragedy. — *By A. Philip McMahon.*  
Chaucer's Lollis. — *By George Lyman Kittredge.*  
A Study of Exposition in Greek Tragedy. — *By Evelyn Spring.*  
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1916-17:  
    De Vicis Atticis. — *By Robert Vincent Cram.*  
    Quid de Poetis Plato censuerit. — *By William Chase Greene.*  
    Quo Modo Graeci res naturales tractaverint. — *By Charles Ross Owens.*  
Indexes.



### CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXIX, 1918.

- Plato's View of Poetry. — *By William Chase Greene.*  
Collations of the Manuscripts of Aristophanes' Aves. — *By John Williams White and Earnest Cary.*  
Joseph Scaliger's Estimates of Greek and Latin Authors. — *By George W. Robinson*  
Indexes.

### CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXX, 1919.

- Collations of the Manuscripts of Aristophanes' Vespae. — *By John Williams White and Earnest Cary.*  
Imperial Coronation Ceremonies of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries. — *By A. E. R. Boak.*  
The Rhetorical Structure of the Encomia of Claudius Claudian. — *By Lester B. Struthers.*  
The Decree-seller in the *Birds*, and the Professional Politicians at Athens. — *By Carl Newell Jackson.*  
Young Virgil's Poetry. — *By Edward Kennard Rand.*  
Indexes.

### CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXI, 1920.

- The Religious Background of the *Prometheus Vinculus*. — *By James Alexander Kerr Thomson.*  
Ἰστέρον πρότερον Ὀμηρικῶς. — *By Samuel E. Bassett.*  
The Spirit of Comedy in Plato. — *By William Chase Greene.*  
Ithaca: A Study of the Homeric Evidence. — *By Frank Brewster.*  
Indexes.

### CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXII, 1921

- The Commentary on Aeschylus' Prometheus in the Codex Neapolitanus. — *By Herbert Weir Smyth.*  
Prophecy in the Ancient Epic. — *By Clifford Herschel Moore.*  
Studies in the Minoan Hieroglyphic Inscriptions. I. The Phaestos Whorl. — *By Champlin Burrage.*  
Indexes.

### CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXIII, 1922

- The Dramatic Art of Sophocles as Revealed by the Fragments of the Lost Plays. — *By Chandler Rathfon Post.*  
Asteris. — *By Frank Brewster.*  
Browning's Ancient Classical Sources. — *By Thurman Los Hood.*  
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1920-21:  
Quaestiones de libello quem Iulius Firmicus Maternus scripsit de errore profanarum religionum. — *By Lester Marsh Prindle.*  
De Sortitione apud Athenienses. — *By Stanley Barney Smith.*  
Index.

### CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXIV, 1923

- The Peloponnesos in the Bronze Age. — *By J. Penrose Harland.*  
The ὑποζώματα of Ancient Ships. — *By Frank Brewster.*  
A New Approach to the Text of Pliny's Letters. — *By Edward Kennard Rand.*  
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1922-23:  
De Scriptura Floriacensi. — *By Frederick Mason Carey.*  
Quibus Rationibus Auctorum Latinorum Opera in Libris Manuscriptis Collecta Sint. — *By Eva Matthews Sanford.*  
Indexes.

### CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXV, 1924

- Cicero's *Orator* and Horace's *Ars Poetica*. — By Mary A. Grant and George Converse Fiske.  
Chachrylion and his Vases. — By Ruth McKnight Elderkin.  
A New Approach to the Text of Pliny's *Letters*. II. — By Edward Kennard Rand.  
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1923-24:  
De Menandri Ironia. — By Warren E. Blake.  
The Greek Helmet. — By Alexander David Fraser.  
De Scholiis in Turonensi Vergili Codice Scriptis. — By John Joseph Savage.  
Index.

### CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXVI, 1925

- A New Approach to the Text of Pliny's *Letters*. III. — By Edward Kennard Rand.  
Ithaca, Dulichium, Same, and Wooded Zacynthus. — By Frank Brewster.  
The Scholia in the Virgil of Tours, *Bernensis* 165. — By John Joseph Savage.  
Who was the Τρεκκαύστρια at Soli? — By William Reginald Halliday.  
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1924-25:  
De Deis Dacicis. — By Leslie Webber Jones.  
De Temporum et Modorum apud Salvianum Usu. — By Harry Knowles Messenger.  
De Ovidii Metamorphoseon aliquot codicibus recensendis. — By William Fletcher Smith.  
Index.

### CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXVII, 1926

- On the History of the *De Vita Caesarum* of Suetonius in the Middle Ages. — By Edward Kennard Rand.  
The Raft of Odysseus. — By Frank Brewster.  
A Revision of the Athenian Tribute Lists. I. — By Benjamin D. Meritt and Allen B. West.  
Summary of Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., 1925-26.  
Quatenus vita Vergiliana Aelio Donato attributa re vera Suetonio Tranquillo debetur quaeritur. — By Russell Mortimer Geer.  
Index.

### CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXVIII, 1927

- The Lepontic Inscriptions and the Ligurian Dialect. — By Joshua Whatmough.  
A Revision of the Athenian Tribute Lists. II. — By Benjamin D. Meritt and Allen B. West.  
Donatus, the Interpreter of Vergil and Terence. — By George Byron Waldrop.  
Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1926-27:  
De principiis cultus imperatorum Romanorum quaestio; quid indigenum quidve extraneum videatur. — By Frederick Folliot.  
De Iudaeorum antiquorum sepulcretis Romae repertis quaestiones selectae. — By Harry J. Leon.  
Quo modo originem mali Plato tractaverit. — By Herbert Benno Hoffleit.  
Index.













PHILLIPS ACADEMY



3 1867 00072 4398

**Date Due**

---

DEC 5 '83

24735

480

H26

(v.39.)

Harvard Studies  
in classical philology

